



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2013

Koinés and Scriptae

Kabatek, Johannes

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich
ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-85157>
Book Section

Originally published at:

Kabatek, Johannes (2013). Koinés and Scriptae. In: Ledgeway, Adam; Smith, John C; Maiden, Martin. The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 143-186.

Koines and Scriptae

Johannes Kabatek, University of Tübingen (Germany)

kabatek@uni-tuebingen.de

1. Introduction
 1. 1. Some terminological preliminaries
 1. 2. Koines and Koineisation
 1. 3. Scriptae
 1. 4. Scriptae and Koines
2. Periods of convergence in medieval Romance
3. The different Romance language areas
 3. 1. Italo-Romance
 3. 2. Gallo-Romance
 3. 3. Ibero-Romance
4. References

1. Introduction

The following chapter discusses processes of linguistic convergence in medieval Romance: the development of supra-regional spoken varieties (*koines*) on the one hand and the emergence of supra-individual orthographic conventions (*scriptae*) on the other. The term *koiné* is sometimes applied both to written and to spoken varieties, whereas the term *scriptae* frequently refers only to non-literary orthographic conventions. For reasons of clarity, I will distinguish the two terms by their medium, using *koiné* for all supra-regional *spoken* varieties and *scripta* for all supra-regional *written* varieties, not without consciousness of their mutual relationship. The article consists of two main parts that are in turn subdivided. In the first part (section 1), I will address various fundamental theoretical and methodological issues concerning the general problem of koineisation and the evolution of scriptae. The second part

(sections 2-3) will then start by focussing on the distinction of different periods of development and go on to describe convergence processes in the Romance language areas of the Middle Ages (up to the Renaissance). In each case, observations on the current state of research and some suggestions for further investigations will be included.

In order to provide an adequate description of the processes of linguistic convergence in the Middle Ages, it is essential to consider both internal and external historical factors. This requires an extensive consideration of the role of institutions and centres of gravity, the analysis of contemporary prestige values within a comprehensive model of linguistic variation, as has become increasingly widespread in medieval research in the last decades. However, particularly in recent years, the increasing implementation of corpus linguistic methods and the possibility of working with extensive data sources has not only allowed for the improvement of historical hypotheses, but has, unfortunately, also led to neglecting theoretical understanding of linguistic variation, since the sheer mass is sometimes assumed to be a substitute for differentiation. Large quantities of data often permit notably the plastic representation of long-term developments, but this is often a starting point rather than the endpoint of an analysis. For instance, the identification of a specific process of linguistic convergence based on large quantities of diachronic data should not mislead to the point of declaring a metaphor in the sense of an "invisible hand" (Keller 1990/1994) as responsible for processes of language change. Rather, it is precisely such an identification that necessitates a detailed analysis of the sub-processes (*innovation, adoption, diffusion, selection, mutation*, cf. Coseriu 1983) to which the change is due, in order to achieve a comprehensive historical description or 'explanation'.

1. 1. Some terminological preliminaries

Even if one of the basic assumptions for historical linguistics is to "use the present to explain the past" (Labov 1975), the transfer of general linguistic knowledge obtained in our current linguistic situation to the Middle Ages does not necessarily always lead to valid results. This is why Medieval Studies has shown a tendency to hesitate and display reservation in adopting the developments of general and synchronic linguistics, conceiving itself as a completely independent discipline. In the Middle Ages, 'everything is different' due to the lack of spoken evidence and to the great divergence of manuscript culture from that of the printed book. Nevertheless, within several

frameworks – like *New Philology* (Wenzel 1990), historical sociolinguistics (Romaine 1982; Gimeno 1995), historical pragmatics (Schlieben-Lange 1983), historical dialectometry (Goebl 2000, 2007), discourse tradition research (Kabatek 2005a, 2008), to mention just a few – attempts are increasingly being made to apply recent linguistic methodology to the Middle Ages. For even in the case of a period in which manuscripts constitute the only record and whose languages are only indirectly accessible, our starting point must be our general linguistic knowledge, so as to establish a method enabling the reconstruction of what is no longer accessible in a second step.

The first distinction that must be made here is that between *text*, text tradition, or, as we prefer, *discourse tradition*, and *language*. When we study the text of any medieval manuscript, we can attempt to deduce the grammar of that text and describe its lexicon. A next step would be to compare the language of that text with that of other texts (from other areas or periods) and assess its representativeness concerning a specific *état de langue*. However, a differentiated study of language would reject this approach and opt for one more complicated, though such simplification may be tempting.

A text is a concrete individual utterance, whereas a language is a supra-individual system of signs. These are two distinct levels, and some grammar models consider the one level to be directly derived from the other. The study of linguistic variation, however, shows us that in general, an individual masters not only one single linguistic system, but several of them – to varying extents – and that in creating individual texts, multiple language systems may be merged. A text *can* in fact be based on a single language system, but this does not necessarily *have* to be the case. In everyday life, it is completely normal in many speech communities that the spoken language of individuals is characterised by elements of varying geographical origin or by a blend of dialect elements mixed to a greater or lesser degree with the standard language (see Hinskens/Auer/Kerswill 2005). In written language however, we rather assume uniformity, a notion that plays a striking role for the conception of language in many branches of linguistics¹. The study of language since the invention of the printing press, the purism of the Academies and the Jacobin uniformism, which has had a great

¹ Due to the variation found in manuscripts, in medieval philology a variation-oriented perspective has been common for a long time in certain linguistic traditions (cf. for example Menéndez Pidal 1926; Brunot 1905). It would be valuable for the field of Medieval Studies if a critical synthesis could be established between the older tradition of the study of variation on the one hand, and more recent medieval variationist findings based on the adoption of contemporary linguistic thought on the other hand, thus correcting the linguistic monolithism derived from the focus on written language (cf. for example Cerquiglini 1989 and, for several proposals in this sense, Hafner/Oesterreicher eds. 2007).

influence on western conception of language since the French Revolution (cf. Schlieben-Lange 1996), have all served to obscure the true heterogeneity of language, which is often considered to be rather an exception to the rule of a uniform, standardised language.

In the Middle Ages, the mono-lingualisation characteristic for the language culture of the Modern times had not yet taken place or was only just starting to occur. We must therefore assume a dynamic conception of language and the possibility of several languages present within a single text. In principle, for medieval languages, as for languages in general, we assume three dimensions of possible variation (Coseriu 1980): varieties according to geographic areas (*diatopic* varieties), varieties depending on social groups (*diastratic* varieties) and varieties pertaining to the style of language (*diaphasic* varieties), which can occur even within the speech of a single speaker in a constant group and at a constant place. In diachronic description, one must actually describe the diachrony of a three-dimensional construction, the “architecture” (Flydal 1951), i.e. the “diasystem” (Weinreich 1954) of the “Historical Language” (Coseriu 1980). The notion of a specific, more or less homogeneous “idiolect” expressed in the texts of an individual is misleading; rather, one must assume a multiple competence that encompasses knowledge of different varieties, which may all be voiced in a single text. This remains the case even in a specific, stable constellation of communication. The crucial tension seeming to characterise the texts of an individual is the antagonism between the mother tongue(s) on the one side and varieties and languages acquired later in life on the other (cf. Miestamo, Sinnemäki, Karlsson 2009), which leads to the question of how to employ the multiple competence in a specific situation, depending on such factors as the assessment of the interlocutor, the content, and the prestige of the linguistic forms. The greater the number of varieties involved, the more complex this tension becomes. A further problem arises from the fact that texts themselves are not only individual utterances but also part of traditional settings, which means that writing (and speaking) involves knowledge of specific textual traditions, so-called *discourse traditions* (cf. Koch 1997, Oesterreicher 1997, Kabatek 2005a, 2005b, 2005c); the latter may influence the choice of elements employed in a text – i.e. not only the ‘textual’ characteristics chosen, such as the specific text form, but also lexical or grammatical elements or even a particular combination of languages (cf. Kabatek 2008).

When analysing an individual’s texts or utterances, one must discern two main characteristics concerning the varieties, apart from the possible influence of a certain

discourse tradition: firstly, the variety the individual is seeking to employ, and secondly the interference of other varieties forming part of the individual's competence, which also influence the utterance/text. A text is at any moment oriented towards a particular language or variety; a speaker or writer is always seeking to realise a specific linguistic system. This orientation can however change within the text as a result of code-switching. The identification of code switching in the case of very closely related medieval Romance systems is sometimes a very difficult task, so that in the analysis of medieval texts, it might sometimes be just as important to find out which variety is intended to be realised in a certain passage as it is to scrutinise the particular linguistic properties of the passage under consideration. Sometimes, code-switching is clearly identifiable and might even appear together with metalinguistic comments, e.g. when Romance passages are incorporated into certain Latin medieval texts (such as charters, chronicles, etc.) as literal quotations, as in the case of the Strasbourg Oaths. But even within a text segment oriented towards a single specific language, elements of various languages can be present, when varieties co-present in the competence of the speaker/writer interfere with the target variety. Here, we must differentiate four types of interference (Coseriu 1977, Kabatek 1996). The first type is the one most frequently taken into consideration, namely the open appearance of elements of a different language/variety from that which the text is oriented towards, e.g. Occitan elements in a northern French text, or Latin elements in a Romance text, or Romance elements in a Latin text. This type of interference is called *transposition interference*, and its result consists in *positive*, i.e. effectively identifiable 'foreign' elements in a text. The contrary is the case with the second and the third type of interference, frequently neglected in the study of linguistic variation. Their results cannot be observed directly as foreign elements in a text. The former of these types of interference, which we may subsume as "negative" interference (following Coseriu 1977), consists in preferring what has been found to be concordant between two varieties. This type of interference can be referred to as *convergence interference*, or simply *convergence*. The third type is complementary to the second and is based on the preference of diverging elements (*divergence interference*, *divergence*). Both negative types of interference lead neither to "mistakes" nor to openly identifiable foreign elements on the text surface, but they do indeed shift the frequency in the use of certain forms. Both types can be found all the more frequently the closer the varieties co-present in the speaker's competence are related, i.e. the more converging elements exist between them, and they are based on a mostly

implicit analysis of elements of different varieties between which the speaker/writer observes analogies as well as differences (as for a medieval application of these concepts, see e.g. Bello Rivas 1998). Finally, a fourth type of interference can be observed, which is likewise based on the contrastive analysis of two languages or varieties. The result, however, lies beyond the traditions of both languages, as the analysis leads to the application of transfer-rules in cases where both varieties actually correspond. This type is traditionally called *hypercorrection* and serves as an important indicator for the reconstruction of the pronunciation of the written language of earlier stages.

1. 2. Koines and Koineisation

If we now assume that all of these types of interference and code-switching may be present in a medieval text, the quest for reconstructing medieval language areas or convergence processes seems virtually impossible. In addition, there remains the problem of the written language, which will be addressed below. On the other hand, it is precisely the variation that enables us to situate a text more accurately. This is a well-known fact in traditional philology, and the notion of determining an author's origin on the grounds of foreign elements or instances of hypercorrection is not new (cf. e.g. Baldinger 1958). It seems, however, that the achievements of present-day variational linguistics should to a greater extent be transferred to medieval studies. Among other things, it would be interesting to investigate in more depth the general circumstances under which certain types and combinations of interference generally appear, in order to look for comparable constellations in medieval texts. Factors such as the degree of elaboration of a text, the proximity of the interfering varieties and the various structuring levels of the language would have to be taken into account. "Phonetic" and "graphic" hypercorrections presumably have a different status than syntactic or lexical ones do; the former generally appear alongside negative interferences leading to shifts in frequency, which means that they are part of the convergence and divergence processes koineisation and scriptae research is interested in (cf. Holtus/Körner/Völker 2001).

A further methodical problem results from what has just been said: how is the difference between variety and interference to be dealt with methodically, if only texts, i.e. utterances, are available, the languages and varieties however are undergoing dynamic processes of change? One could cite the familiar criticism of the unobservable

nature of linguistic change from a synchronic perspective. However, it is by no means true that all that has been passed on from the Middle Ages is a hopeless linguistic chaos of variation: we are aware – at least to a great extent – of the Latin basis of the Romance languages. We know the present-day varieties which have emerged from the medieval ones and in part remain surprisingly similar to them, and, besides all variation, we also know large areas of stability in the languages of the Middle Ages as well as clearly identifiable phenomena indicating dynamics.

The reconstruction of the medieval Romance *scriptae* and *koinés* thus implies their re-contextualisation within the entire building of the architecture of the medieval languages and varieties (Oesterreicher 2001, Koch 2003). In recent decades, various attempts have been made to add a ‘diamesic’ component to this architecture (cf. Mioni 1983), differentiating spoken and written varieties as well as varieties according to a continuum between immediacy and distance (Koch/Oesterreicher 1985 and 1994). Other authors have pointed out that such an expansion refers to a level different from that of linguistic variation, as the relationship between varieties and spoken and written language, on the one hand, is a purely medial one, characterised by the possibility that basically any variety may be expressed in written or spoken form. On the other hand, it is also a qualitative relationship, which stems from the fact that only certain varieties actually are written whereas others are not. Moreover, specific written discourse traditions may emerge that are shaped by the medial possibilities offered by written language; these may lead to the creation of specific styles linked to the written language (Kabatek 2000b).

It is precisely the interplay between language and speech, between the system and the creative behaviour of the speaker that results in the diasystem of the historical language not being rigid, but dynamic. This interplay also means that individual processes of convergence and divergence observable in texts can lead to convergence or divergence of languages at an abstract level. Individual convergence is a correlate of dialogue and of power and prestige relationships, whereas linguistic convergence is a correlate of communicative networks with the corresponding centres of gravity and their power and prestige, which determine the individual dialogue culture. This means that in order to examine linguistic convergence, one must consider the operation of individual processes on the one hand, and the social communication structures within which dialogical convergence processes may occur on the other (cf. also Auer/Hinskens/Kerswill 2005). These structures are outward correlates of communities

organised in various cultural institutions, from the family over the monastery or castle to the village or town or other political or religious units, where the complexity of the respective institution may go along with that of its internal organisation.

Our observations result in the following challenges for the analysis and characterisation of koineisation processes in the Middle Ages: firstly, the texts must be analysed in reference to the underlying languages. Secondly – and this is particularly important for the question of linguistic dynamics – the dynamics inherent to the texts must be put in relation to the architecture of the language. For a particular text cannot simply be located somewhere at a fixed place in the diasystem of a language. Rather, in dynamic situations especially, a text often 'originates from a specific language (or variety)' and simultaneously 'heads towards a specific language (or variety)'. In this context, it is of vital importance which portions of a text can be attributed to the language learned earlier on and which to the one acquired later. For example, a strikingly large number of Castilian words appear in the Old Portuguese *Foros de Castelo Rodrigo* (cf. Cintra 1959), so that one could assume these suggest a Castilian-speaking author. But it could also be the case that, contrariwise, the castilianisms concerned are Castilian loanwords already perceived as normal in the Portuguese legal terminology of the time, thus indicating a general process of convergence. It is sometimes very difficult to judge whether a particular element in a text is an individual interference or testifies to a new linguistic tradition, in which it figures as a loan element. The decision must be the result of an interpretative reconstruction process, in which language-external and language-internal data are deliberated in order to approach the most probable language-historic interpretation. This consequently leads to the third challenge of obtaining extensive knowledge of the available language-internal data of the corresponding language area, and the fourth challenge of obtaining extensive historical knowledge of cultural institutions and social developments. Meta-linguistic comments and names of languages take on an intermediate position between external and internal data. Language names (cf. Kabatek/Schlieben-Lange 2000) especially are important indicators of convergence or divergence processes, as they can demarcate an established linguistic area as well as create or consolidate linguistic boundaries; they can be derived from or motivated by linguistic realities (such as particular linguistic characteristics) or non-linguistic ones (such as political boundaries).

1.3. Scripta

Since all of the steps necessary to researching koineisation lead to an ever-increasing uncertainty in interpretation and the entirety of available information must ultimately be derived from the mass of manuscripts and from comparative historic reconstruction, so-called *Scripta research* has become established as a sub-discipline of medieval studies, above all in Gallo-Romance studies. This field is predominantly limited to the study of written phenomena, for which an increasingly refined method has been developed in the course of the twentieth century. The term *scripta* goes back to Remacle 1948; it generally designates a particular (and in his narrow approach a non-literary) medieval writing tradition. Between the 1940s and 1960s, scripta research was developed mainly by Carl Theodor Gossen (cf. Gossen 1967), who also coined the term *scriptology*. The field of scripta research is critical of the naive equation of regional written language with regional dialect and thus consistently opposes the notion, attributed to Gaston Raynaud, that regional, dated legal documents provide direct insight into medieval dialects². In contrast, descriptions of medieval “writing landscapes” (‘Schreiblandschaften’, Gossen 1968) have been called for³, established on the basis of data found in the medieval *Chartes*, which are classified and evaluated according to diatopic and diachronic criteria. These reveal the heterogeneity of the scripta, which is a “continuum hybride et composite” (Goebel 1975, 147) in which a single scribe may use various forms to spell the same word⁴ – contrarily to the 19th century assumption that such is the case only for the literary language, due mainly to changes made by copyists. Thus, parallel documents written by different scribes at the same time as well as different documents written by the same scribe are particularly informative for scripta research. There are tendencies both towards a predominately quantitative analysis and towards a qualitative, philological analysis in detail. In quantitative analysis, a historical linguistic geography has taken root in research on French, as Ramón Menéndez Pidal had previously outlined for Spanish: linguistic data are copied onto maps, from which the medieval writing landscape can be derived. This line of research has been spurred significantly by computer-aided data analysis, which was

² « Les chartes ... offrent donc la langue vulgaire dans toute sa vérité, et sont de beaucoup les sources les plus précieuses pour l'étude des dialectes. » (Raynaud 1876, 54)

³ It is repeatedly stressed that there is a certain, but by no means direct, relationship between regional dialect and scripta: « Les langues écrites régionales de la France du Nord laissent entrevoir, à des degrés très différents, les dialectes du moyen âge, mais elles ne sont nullement identiques avec ces dialectes. » (Gossen 1968, 4)

⁴ This was introduced by Gossen as an argument against the possibility of a direct relationship between the written and the spoken language: „Entsprächen die genannten Grapheme wirklich alle lautlichen Realitäten, so müßte man sich fragen, wieso ein und derselbe Schreiber in derselben Urkunde für denselben Laut desselben Wortes mehrere Graphien verwendet. Er besaß doch sicher für das betreffende Wort nur eine Aussprache!“ (Gossen 1967, 15)

conducted at length for the first time by Hans Goebl (1970) for medieval Normandy and allowed the analysis of immense data quantities. In the 1980s, most notably Anthonij Dees (1980, 1987) extended this quantitative, statistical approach to other areas, examining the entire northern French area and also including the writing landscape of literary texts (Dees 1987). Apart from certain polemics between individual researchers (Gossen 1982; Dees 1987, XIV), one can observe that the field of scripta research has become a firmly established discipline with a clearly defined method, particularly in the case of the northern French area. Its method involves the following steps:

- selecting an area to study,
- selecting a corpus to analyse as well as a particular period,
- selecting several ‘traits scripturaires’ considered to be relevant,
- statistical analysis of the corresponding relevant characteristics and cartographic representation,
- diachronic and historical interpretation of the statistical evaluation.

The selection of a particular area is made according to historical and political criteria or with regard to certain historic linguistic areas. It is wise to outline diachronic areas of convergence or divergence, as certain processes taking place in these areas are to be the point of attention.

When selecting a corpus, the beginning of the Romance period is generally set as the terminus *a quo*, and the achievement of a more or less unified, supra-regional orthography is set as the terminus *ad quem*. In the case of French, this corresponds to the beginning of extensive Romance document production in the thirteenth century and to the decree of Villers-Cotterêts respectively, in which the *langage maternel françois* was stipulated to be the exclusively written language for legal documents. The latter boundary is not disputed and is similarly connected to humanistic unifying tendencies and the development of the printing press in the other language areas. Studies similar to those of scripta research for later periods would only make sense if different types of texts (e.g. private correspondence) were selected. At the other diachronic end, the restriction to Romance texts should be partially exceeded inasmuch as writing landscapes indeed can already begin to emerge within the Latin tradition, especially in the case of vernacular names for places and people which already appear in their vernacular form in the Latin texts. These may be considered a testing-ground (‘Versuchsfeld’, Goebl 1970, 119) for the emergence of written Romance, even if the statistical analysis of elements occurring only sporadically is not possible to the same extent as in texts clearly

characterized as Romance. When selecting the corpus, attention must be paid above all to the reliability of the transcriptions or editions, since many of the documents transcribed for historical documentation rather than for philological purposes prove to be unreliable⁵. On the one hand, large document collections are important, yet on the other, the significance of smaller collections and individual ‘exceptions’ has also been pointed out (Gossen 1979, 265ff.).

The determination of the “traits scripturaires” must be carried out on the basis of an intensive comparison of as diverse documents as possible; historical linguistic information extending beyond that in the corpus must also be consulted in order to select characteristics due to display variation in the area in question and in order to exclude homogeneous characteristics. A basic principle is that, mostly, there is no single trait that is characteristic for a scripta, and a quantitative variationist analysis (in the sense of Labov) may not be based upon a particular isolated element. Rather, a “particolare combinazione” (Ascoli 1876) of written forms is characteristic for a *scripta*.

The statistical analysis initially takes place on the basis of the observation of a ‘habitual frequency’ of certain forms within the whole corpus. Then, deviations are measured within individual sections of the corpus, which are divided according to geographic and temporal criteria. These deviations are transferred to maps which take the aforementioned diatopic and diachronic differentiation into account. Furthermore, it has proven to be fruitful to include the distinction between original documents and copies in this process, as advocated by Goebel (see Goebel 1995) in contrast to Dees, as the differences between both documents reveal a certain *direction* in the evolution of a scripta – similarly to what has been claimed above for hypercorrect forms. Frequently, in this evolution, a high degree of regionality may be observed in the original texts and a higher degree of supra-regionality in the copies intended to be archived in the scriptorium.

Recently, the question of considering further parameters of variation in scripta analysis has been increasingly discussed (cf. Goebel 1995, Völker 2001a and 2001b.). However, the inclusion of diastratic and diaphasic criteria does not appear to be unproblematic, given the marginal variation due to these factors in the documents and the danger of proposing interpretations which the sources permit with reserve only.

⁵ An overview of Romance documents up to the end of the thirteenth century can be found in Frank/Hartmann 1997.

1.4. Scripta and Koiné

The final of the above-mentioned steps, namely the diachronic and historical interpretation of the data, actually goes beyond mere scripta research, and there is no fully developed method for it, so that intuitive judgements are applied in many studies. This step, however, is the truly relevant one for historical linguistics. In order to achieve an adequate interpretation, historical data and information on later evolutions must be combined. It can be observed that, with respect to the emergent language areas in the Middle Ages, computationally synthesised data of twentieth century linguistic atlases show surprising parallels to the synthesised data of medieval scripta research. This is why Goebl regards the data of the ALF alongside the data of scriptology in his studies (Goebl 2000, 2002, 2003, 2006). There is no doubt that medieval documents and medieval dialects are related to a certain extent, and indeed this relation provided the basis for a document-based medieval ‘dialectology’, though this relation is increasingly obscured as dedialectalisation unrolls throughout the course of history. The *traits scripturaires* as indications are always also symptoms of specific social and cultural constellations which, in turn, may correspond to linguistic traits with varying degrees of probability. From a methodical point of view, however, various obstacles encounter in the process of reconstructing the relationship to the spoken language: in the manuscripts, the spelling, particularly in the case of questionable elements, is frequently not uniform. The different written forms may have corresponded either to a single phonetic form or to different co-existent ones, due to the arbitrary relation between sound and graphemes, and in the end, a stable orthography does not necessarily have to correspond to a spoken reality, but could instead result from a merely written convention. Both to completely reject any relation between written and spoken language and to conceive of dialects as directly mirrored in medieval documents would be exaggerated and extreme positions (cf. Dees 1985; Remacle 1992). A relationship is probable, but not necessary, since the writers may originate from other areas (Monfrin 1968) or be orientated towards other varieties. Restricting the means of localising manuscripts to purely extra-linguistic factors, as has been called for since Carolus-Barré (1964), can only offer hints, given that the place in which a document was produced certainly does not at all necessarily determine the language. For this reason, *all* available factors must be considered: those that can be derived from the language of the manuscript, those to be derived from its content, those from its outer form (Frank 1994), those derived from palaeographic analysis and, finally, all the external circumstances that might contribute to an adequate interpretation. Whilst however the analyses of scripta research, which are

restricted to written language, can deduce concrete objective results from the facts present in the underlying documents, a ‘medieval dialectology’ will always remain hypothetical and at best be able to indicate certain probabilities based on peripheral data. These probabilities, alongside the medieval and modern writing landscapes, are the third point of reference for calculating the unknown side of a triangle. An ‘objective’ method in this procedure can only be approximate and probabilistic, but the degree of probability could indeed be substantiated by a multi-factored statistical analysis. One must always remain aware, however, that statistics will never be able to examine or ‘explain’ what actually happened, but merely quantify the sum of single events. Nonetheless, they can provide a useful framework and starting point for the detailed philological analysis and interpretation of the individual texts.

2. Periods of convergence in medieval Romance

If we consider the development of koineisation tendencies and writing traditions in medieval Romance languages as a whole, we can observe certain parallels between the different areas, which permit a classification into different phases (cf. also Koch 1988; Krefeld 1988). These parallels however take on quite different shapes in the individual areas and are sometimes not chronologically identical.

The first phase could be called ‘prehistoric’ Romance, lasting up to the appearance of the first written documents of clearly Romance form. At this point, many of the typically Romance characteristics are already established in the spoken dialects as opposed to written Latin, but Latin as the relatively uniform written *Dachsprache* (‘roof-language’, Kloss 1987) conceals these differences from later examination, rendering the postulation of certain convergences or divergences between Romance varieties rather speculative. Though signs of Romanity are repeatedly found in Latin texts, there are no clearly Romance texts yet. Still, it is possible to reconstruct Romance language areas even for this first phase, since, first of all, the later linguistic evolution permits inferences, and secondly, at least a rough division of areas is mirrored in the Latin texts of the third to ninth centuries (cf. Bonfante 1999, Lausberg 1963, I, 39f., Kontzi 1982 and above all Herman 1990). The sources for this phase are Latin and in part Greek texts which permit deductions of Romance articulation and certain syntactic phenomena. Since the 1960s (cf. Sabatini 1968), research in this area has increasingly tended to consider the *scripta latina rustica* in connection with the clearly Romance scriptae, since it can be observed that more and more Romance or proto-Romance elements figure in certain Latin texts (mainly in less formulaic parts of documents) in various areas from roughly the

sixth century onwards. These proto-Romance elements in Latin lay the foundations for the emergence of the first Romance texts in the second phase.

This second phase could be called that of ‘sporadic Romance’, in which indeed rare but nonetheless available written evidence and meta-linguistic comments indicate a consciousness of Romanity. One might object that the sporadic appearances of Romance texts starting in the ninth century are but isolated instances and that, really, this is still the continuation of the first phase. But we must presuppose a consciousness of distinction between Latin and Romance unattested previously when we look at the composition of the Strasbourg Oaths, the Eulalia Sequence, the Placito Capuano, the Glosas Emilianenses or other supposedly isolated Romance texts, even if a more or less long period of transition and considerable differences between the various regions and centres must be assumed. This consciousness seems to be based on an apparently paradoxical development, which occurred repeatedly in a similar way throughout the history of the Romance languages: it is generally agreed upon that the main cause for the consciousness of Romance was the re-koineisation of Latin, i.e. the reform of the pronunciation of written Latin, which spread in several waves in the Romance areas at different times. The goal of this reform was actually to achieve uniformity, but as a side-effect, an awareness of the gulf between the claim of unity and the heterogeneous linguistic reality was created. In ninth century France, it was the Carolingian *Correctio*, initiated by Irish and English monks and with Alcuin of York in a pivotal role, that modified the spelling and pronunciation of Latin texts (Wright 1982). In the eleventh century, the Clunic reform of Latin reached the Iberian Peninsula, whereas in Italy the effects of the reforms were weaker, maybe also due to the smaller distance of the vernacular from Latin (cf. Raible 1993, 236).

The first known texts resulting from the differentiation between Latin and Romance (Banniard 2006) display an array of common characteristics (Lüdtke 1964, Renzi 1985, 239ff., Koch 1993, Selig 2001): they are testimonies to spoken language marked as vernacular for reasons of authenticity, e.g. in oaths, records, notes in records (cf. Wunderli 1965, Sabatini 1963/1964, 149f., Petrucci/Romeo 1992, 116ff.), vow formulae, lists, commentaries, glosses (Wright 1982, Quilis 1999) etc., or religious texts intended to propagate Christian thought, as the use of writing was generally tied to the monopoly of the clergy. Larger works of literature (such as Occitan troubador poetry or early epics such as the *Chanson de Roland* or the Castilian *Poema de mio Cid*) are sometimes attributed to this period of ‘sporadic Romance’ as well, though one must bear in mind that they were passed on in manuscripts that must actually be attributed to the next phase. It is striking that, though early evidence of written Romance exists, the phase of ‘sporadic Romance’ lasted for a relatively long time: in spite of an

attestable consciousness of distinction – or perhaps precisely for that reason – the diglossic situation, in which the written language was almost exclusively Latin, remained stable for several centuries. In the second phase, we can identify certain historical events concerning koineisation tendencies that presumably led to instances of convergence, but we have no direct written tradition. Thus we may assume that certain cities of growing importance at this time (e.g. Pavia, Bologna, Paris, Toulouse, Montpellier, Barcelona, Burgos, Toledo, Lisbon etc.) became centres of development for urban varieties that subsequently could spread to their environs to various degrees. As far as the writing of this sporadic evidence is concerned, it on the one hand corresponds to a spontaneous attempt to find adequate Latin graphemes to express certain phonetic realities with no established vernacular tradition (“Verschriftung” in the sense of Oesterreicher 1993). On the other hand, spelling traditions for Romance elements developed within Latin during the first phase already existed (e.g. for the representation of proper names), with certain tendencies towards areas of convergence even in the earliest Romance texts (Sabatini 1968, Hilty 1973).

The appearance of the first series of texts marks the beginning of the third phase: at first it is in legal texts – feudal oaths and other legal documents – that the vernacular appears in the less formulaic parts, taking protocol of orality, and subsequently spreading to the other parts of the documents. This happens in the south of France from the beginning of the XIIth century onwards. In the following century, the same process takes place in other Romance areas, where it actually occurs rather swiftly in certain centres after a long period of diglossia, so that one cannot really speak of a gradual development: rather, certain underlying external factors must have initiated this process. These factors may be linked to those salient for the fourth phase, which will be discussed below. Certain religious orders (Knights of the Temple, Benedictines) and their centres seem to have played an important role in this process by promoting the spread of the Romance writing tradition. The emergence of Romance writing must also be seen in the context of a general, predominantly Latin ‘explosion’ of text production from the end of the twelfth century onwards (Raible 1993), in comparison to which Romance texts are actually only a by-product. A factor of central importance for the emergence of certain Romance writing traditions is their pragmatic context, where Latin-educated scribes or readers transmit information to illiterate speakers or listeners by reading aloud and writing records of juridical acts with Romance passages (Lüdtkke 1964, Wunderli 1965, Sabatini 1968 etc., Selig 1995 and 2001). The scribes, who were closely tied to the monasteries, developed individual and local traditions, which in part became supra-regional scriptae. In certain areas, particularly in northern France, a tendency towards establishing

supra-regional language areas can be observed from the first series of texts on. Generally however, linguistic heterogeneity appears to have been more widespread in supra-regional communication than in later periods. Multilingualism was the norm in the domain of the monasteries; the monks often did not come from the area of the monastery and frequently would move on to other places.

The fourth phase is characterised by a range of historical and social phenomena which, amongst other effects, also brought about a radical change in the linguistic situation. These phenomena have been subsumed under the term *Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Haskins 1927), including the establishment of intellectual centres, the new education in Classical Latin, the growing significance of historiography, abundant translation activity, the renaissance of jurisprudence, science and philosophy as well as the founding of the first occidental universities. This renaissance took place in a time of growing significance of the cities, secularisation of society and emergent political centralisation. The meaning of these radical changes for written Romance is best illustrated in the judicial domain: here, the most important innovation of the twelfth century was a rediscovered concern for Roman law, especially at the new University of Bologna, which soon became the centre of legal education for all of Europe. The “Bologna Discourse” (Kabatek 2001, 2005a) consisted in a new way of thinking, the orientation towards a particular institutional centre and a new and restored knowledge of Latin. It almost immediately reached monastic and secular centres throughout Europe, above all due to its combination of civil and canonical law. The Latin texts of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* were studied in these centres, but by the end of the twelfth century, Romance texts summarising the new legal system started appearing, at first in southern France, where there was already an established tradition of Romance documents, and then in northern France as well, in the countries of the crusades and on the Iberian Peninsula, whereas in Italy, Latin still dominated at this point. These compendia for legal practitioners created a new opening for vernacular varieties and led to a functional linguistic differentiation between the Late Classical Latin of legal academia and the Romance texts for practitioners. In some places, a vernacular literature was written parallel to the legal texts, and sometimes by the same hand. This had direct connections to the new way of thinking and to Roman law, as observable in the works of Marie de France or Gonzalo de Berceo. Parallel to its effects on jurisprudence, the renaissance also impacted other scientific domains. Courtly use of Romance led to the development of genuine linguistic centres in various areas, which probably did more than exercise linguistic gravitation only in questions of writing. This is particularly evident in the case of Paris and Toledo, where, after a certain period of

consolidation during which different linguistic influences from outside converged in these centres, urban elements actually began to spread in the opposite direction. In the age of manuscripts, this spreading initially only concerned certain classes of the environs who maintained contact with the centre. Also, at first, it probably only affected written language and certain contact varieties. The more an obvious asymmetry of power took root, the more a verticalisation of influence developed: the koiné also spread to groups who had but indirect contact to the centre, via others. In the written domain, this verticalisation occurred chiefly after the introduction of the printing press and the debate on orthography it triggered. The fourth phase is also the one during which the Romance languages broke away from Latin to a great extent, yet concomitantly opened themselves to a process of re-Latinisation in certain text genres (Raible 1996, Barra Jover 2008). The languages were elaborated during this period, i.e. they were used for an ever increasing range of discourse traditions. After the development of their basic structure and their construction throughout centuries of orality, the vocabulary and the textual techniques required for certain written texts were developed as part of the process of elaboration (in the sense of “Ausbau”, Kloss 1987 or “Verschriftlichung“, Oesterreicher 1993). Yet whilst the development of the basic structures of individual Romance languages in contrast to Latin is a phenomenon of orality, the fourth phase is characterised by renewed European convergence of certain writing phenomena in pan-European discourse traditions, alongside the delimitation of individual Romance language areas.

Looking at the general question of the evolution of written and spoken Romance areas, it can be stated that we are dealing with a process that had its starting point in a situation with oral dialect diversity, but with Latin as a uniform written language. The next stage is the emancipation of regional vernacular writing traditions based on oral varieties, leading to supra-regionalisation and unification of these traditions, coinciding with the emergence of supra-regional koinés. Thus, the end of the process resembles the beginning: supra-regional *Dachsprachen* (“roof-languages” Kloss 1987) and their corresponding written forms dominate local varieties, with the significant difference that the original uniformity of the *Dachsprache* is now perforated by areas opposed to each other, having different standard languages. To a certain extent, the underlying dialectal continuum at first remained almost unaffected by this entire evolution. It is only in the course of the following centuries (and particularly from the nineteenth century onwards) that different new linguistic boundaries emerged within this continuum as a result of vertical contact with different standard languages. This partially goes hand in hand with the complete disappearance of the basic dialects.

3. The Romance language areas from East to West

The following remarks on Romance language areas are not intended to be complete. Rather, the aim is to indicate a series of general aspects highlighting some of the crucial facts and providing basic bibliographical information. The division into areas is a rather general one and must not distract from the fact that, on the one hand, we have to deal with a dialect continuum without real divisions, and that, on the other hand, in the Middle Ages, most of the larger linguistic areas are still emerging, apart from larger and already established areas such as those of written Latin and Arabic. If we concentrate on these emergent areas, we will have to avoid any anachronistic national linguistic history based on national borders established later (Kabatek 2007). In Romance historiography, it is generally assumed that variation is characteristic for the Middle Ages, but for later stages, the perspective switches to a unified perspective without sufficient consideration of the continuity of variation. The growing importance of certain centres will always leave other areas peripheral, with an inherent potential for emancipation, as turned out to be the case in several regions across Europe in the nineteenth century.

We will have to leave aside the Balkan-Romance area, dominated by Slavic in the Middle Ages, since only speculative comments can be made on koineisation processes at the time we are examining, as written Romance texts do not exist. We will also leave aside the Rhetoromance area, where reconstruction is only possible with great reservation, due to the lack of written texts. Even if sporadic written evidence of what we have called the ‘second phase’ exists, the presence of German did not permit the stabilisation of an independent written Romance language, nor the development of supra-regional koinés. Documents such as the *Würzburger Federprobe* (‘Würzburg gloss’ tenth/eleventh century) or the *Einsiedel Interlinear Version* (late eleventh century) may of course belong to a period of more extensive text production; nonetheless, it does not appear to be the case that genuinely Grison-Romance, Ladin or Friaulic scriptae could have emerged (cf. amongst others Liver 1995). For reasons of space, Dalmatian will also be disregarded (cf. Tagliavini 1972, 467ff.).

3.1. Italo-Romance

In no other Romance language area has the question of the koiné given rise to such a prolonged and controversial debate as in Italy. Thus, the Italian notion of the *questione della lingua* has become a prototypical label for meta-linguistic discussion of the (predominantly literary) koiné. The scientific debate of this question addresses not only the explicit disagreement concerning the Italian standard language since the sixteenth and in part since the fourteenth century, but also the ‘pre-history’, i.e. the question of uniformity and diversity of Italian dialects in the pre-literary period or the problem of regional characterisation or supra-regionality of the earliest written testimonies. The case of Italian Studies also shows how different the perspective on the language of the Middle Ages appears to be in the Romance sub-disciplines, a fact that makes comparison between the different areas such as Italo-Romance or Ibero-Romance difficult: the boundaries of what are considered to be Romance linguistic monuments vary greatly (Frank/Hartmann 1997, I, 36) and, since indisputably Romance document series or elaborated written texts appear only relatively late in the Italo-Romance area (Trifone 2006, 1167), there is a tendency in Italian Studies to consider as early Romance texts a large number of short inscriptions, marginal notes or fragments which are only partly Romance. In other areas, where extensive vernacular text series are available far earlier, such texts are only considered with marginal significance.

Within our proposal of different phases of evolution (see section 2; cf. also Devoto 1953, Koch 1988, Krefeld 1988), the first phase can be said to end for Italian in 960, since the formulaic oaths of the *Placiti Cassinesi* are generally seen to be the first clearly vernacular monuments marking the beginning of the linguistic history of written Italian. For reasons of reconstruction, it is difficult to determine how far back the pre-history of Romance stretches. According to the principle that the end of a political unit allows for diversity to arise, it can be assumed that a first important step in the direction of a vernacularisation of Italy is achieved with the Germanic invasions in the sixth century. The groundwork for the emergence of the Italian dialects is the relative unity of Latin on the Appenine Peninsula. Following Terracini (1956), this unity is confirmed above all in the lexical domain; the Magra-Rubicon line, which divides northern Italy from the centre, seems to correspond to a basically phonetic distinction. First evidence of Romance forms can be found in texts from the seventh and eighth centuries. Various Papyri from Ravenna dating back partly even to the sixth century (Sabatini 1965 and 1978) show characteristics of ‘Romance’ morphology. The existence of Greek interlinear versions even allows us to determine phonetic tendencies. In general, in this first phase,

numerous ‘Romance’ elements may be found in Latin legal texts (cf. Raible 1993, Hartmann 1994). Langobardian legal Latin, baptised *Volgare Italico* by Sanga 1995, is a mixed form between Classical Latin and elements of the vernacular, which appear in the syntax and in the lexicon, above all with respect to proper names. This legal written language appears to be relatively uniform across the entire Langobardian kingdom, showing gradual distance to the vernacular according to different text types. The question of uniformity and convergence would require closer examination (see Jodl 2003), but far-reaching, supra-regional quantitative studies of scriptae in the Italo-Romance area are still lacking (for Northern Italy, see now Videsott 2009). In particular, examples of ‘Romance’ elements may be found in report-style notes (written sometimes on the back of deeds) that were used for later elaborations of a document (Sabatini 1965), but they are also found in the text of the deeds themselves. On the threshold between the ‘first phase’ and the ‘second phase’, we find the *Indovinello Veronese*, a more Romance than Latin text from the second half of the eighth century (Hausmann 1999), and the *Placitum Capuanum*, dated March 960, which includes an entire sentence in Romance (*Sao ko kelle terre, per kelle fini que ki contene, trenta anni le possette parte Sancti Benedicti* cf. Migliorini 1961, 92). The form *sao* (in contrast to dialectal *saccio*), was interpreted by Bartoli (1944-45) as a first sign of linguistic unity, a very first tendency towards koineisation in a text actually employing a dialectally marked vernacular. In opposition, it has been claimed that the form could be due to analogy, without any necessary supra-regional influence (for discussion cf. Sanga 1995, 82). The decline of the Langobardian unity and the political division of Italy once again led to the penetration of regional elements. Characteristic for the following phases is the emergence of various written *scriptae* with spoken correlates. Sanga (1995, 85f.) distinguishes between the southern *Volgare Beneventano*, the central *Volgare Toscano* and a northern *Lingua Lombarda*, written forms which partially coexisted in time. However, instead of being genuinely uniform and stable written traditions, these regional varieties still show tendencies of sporadic writing. Apart from the studies on the northern scriptae by Videsott 2009, detailed analyses of these texts with systematic references to the current dialectal situation are still a desideratum. A striking characteristic of Italian seems to be the fact that the phases sketched in section 2 do not appear in a linear sequence, but rather correspond to different areas: thus, the written traditions associated with the Benedictine monasteries in the south and Montecassino as the centre (the so-called *Volgare Beneventano*) display comparatively uniform characteristics, even if these texts (e.g. *Ritmo su S. Alessio*, *Pianta della Madonna*) belong to a relatively early period (between the tenth and twelfth centuries) and should rather be prone to be attributed to the

period of sporadic Romance text production (our 'second phase'). In contrast to these monastic traditions, the *Volgare Toscano*, a written language which emerged from the twelfth century onwards and above all in the thirteenth century, stems almost exclusively from the domain of trade and the application of law (e.g. *Conto Navale Pisano*, *Libro di Banchieri Fiorentini*). It is, to a large extent, attributable to the fourth phase of regional consolidation, the third phase remaining predominantly Latin in Italian legal documents, in contrast to other areas. The *Volgare Toscano* emerged from expanding trade and from the growing significance of cities and of the Bourgeoisie and is actually closely linked to the renaissance of Roman law and the consequent linguistic division between the 'instructed Latin' texts of the lawyers and the 'everyday' practical texts written in vulgar language (cf. Castellani 1982). A clear division of functions, target groups and languages also seems to be responsible for the fact that Tuscan, in contrast to the monastic written forms of the south, was much more a product emerging from the spoken language. It did not actually seek to achieve a symbiosis of Latin and Romance elements, but rather showed linguistic independence and a clear-cut differentiation of languages, as was observable in several Romance areas in the aftermath of the Bolognese renaissance in the thirteenth century. From the thirteenth century onwards, a third focus of written vernacular is manifested in the north of Italy; namely the *Lingua Lombarda* or *Koinè Padana*, which is the most evident continuation of the archaic tendencies of the *Volgare Italico*. This is a supra-regional literary written language, in which a large part of the early Italian literary texts were produced. The Latinate and rhetoric background of a courtly author such as Guido Fava gives a certain aura of distance to his texts (Koch 1987). An exception in the Italian thirteenth century tradition is the school of Sicilian poetry, which can also be attributed to the fourth phase and shows direct ties to the University of Bologna. It came into being as part of Frederick II's Magna Curia and had strong links to the southern French troubadors, as a literary phenomenon of rather short life (1230-1260) and was based more on Latin and Provençal models than on the Sicilian dialect.

Contrary to the archaic tendencies of the north and the south, Tuscany displays its own innovative tendencies, providing a balance between the dialectal differences and soon coming to play a leading role in the further convergence of the written language. This was not so much the result of the immediate spread of Tuscan, but rather due to the conscious elaboration of the Florentine dialect, where a selection process sorted out elements considered as dialectal and Latin elements were borrowed in order to create a *Volgare illustre* from the end of the thirteenth century onwards. This by no means resolves the *questione della lingua*, which in the Renaissance essentially concerns the competition between Tuscan and the *lingua*

cortigiana. However, the koiné based on Tuscan becomes clearly predominant and outdoes its competitors in the course of the centuries. This can basically be attributed to the high prestige acquired by Florentine as the language of the *Tre corone* Dante, Petrarca and Boccaccio, as well as to the central geographical position and the economic significance of the city of Florence. The dominance of Florentine both over Latin and the other Italian dialects is in fact not achieved until P. Bembo's grammatical and stylistic prescriptions in the sixteenth century, giving rise to a new conflict which shifted the focus of the *questione della lingua* to the difference between the literary language of the *Tre corone* and the spoken language.

In summary, it can be said that in the case of Italian, 'Romance' elements can be observed very early on in written Latin texts, but writing in Romance remains an exception for a long time, and only towards the end of the thirteenth century does an extensive production of written Romance texts begin. Tuscany plays a leading role in this evolution as a result of its central position and the significance of the Tuscan cities, but also due to the prestige of its literary production. The dominance of Tuscan is, however, not linked to any constant political and cultural centre of radiation. Therefore, in Italy, the inexistence of a common spoken language linked to the written language remains fact for a long time.

3. 1. 2. Sardinian

In the case of Sardinian, it is particularly evident that external developments are of crucial significance for the history of the written language. The establishment of the jurisdicative areas of Gallura, Torres, Arborea and Cagliari in the eleventh century appears to have been based on ethnic-cultural boundaries and to have even strengthened the significance of these boundaries from a dialectal point of view (Blasco Ferrer 1984, 63). Almost no traces of Sardinian are extant from the first phase, which can thus only be reconstructed; the second phase is practically skipped (various texts which supposedly could be attributed to this period having been proven forgeries; cf. Frank/Hartmann 1997, I, 28ff.), since a relatively stable Sardinian text production appears unforeseen (cf. Blasco Ferrer 1984; 1993; 1995). The explanation for this is an 'external' development; namely the arrival of Benedictine monks from Montecassino at the end of the eleventh century. They initiated an extensive text production, which soon also spread to local writers. In the Romance passages of juridical documents, differences related to the various local dialects can be observed between a Campidanese and a Logudorese scripta, even if in fact the influence of the peninsular models is the dominant one. With the loss of Sardinian autonomy in 1297 and the Catalan-Aragonese

conquest between 1323 and 1410, Sardinian again disappeared from legal documents. The lack of political unity and the permanent presence of other prestige languages (Catalan, Spanish, Italian) prevented Sardinian koineisation in the following period and kept Sardinian at the stage of dialectal fragmentation.

3.2. Gallo-Romance

The Romance language area for which the problem of medieval linguistic convergence has been by far best studied is Gallo-Romance, the language area stretching from the border with Italo-Romance and Ibero-Romance up to the Germanic language area. It will not be possible to discuss the individual regions in detail; the observations in the following section must be restricted to some general aspects of French and Occitan.

3.2.1. French

In traditional approaches, the medieval history of northern France used to be considered as part of the national history in the sense of a pre-history of literary Classical French. Old French appeared, particularly in university teaching, as a rather unified and standardised language. During the last few decades, a different view has emerged, with predecessors in language geography studies since Gilliéron, in scriptological approaches and, more recently, in studies stressing varieties and variation within the medieval languages (amongst others Cerquiglini 1989, Buridant 2000, Völker 2003, 2006, Hafner/Oesterreicher 2007) and applying sociolinguistic terminology and methods to medieval linguistics (e.g. Wright 1982, 2001, Banniard 1992, Lodge 1993). In the case of French, the central questions relevant to our topic are the following:

- the question of the dialectal basis for processes of convergence (phase I),
- the question of possible tendencies of convergence in the sporadic Romance texts before 1200 (phase II)
- the emergence of regional written traditions in Romance from the twelfth century onwards, their inner development and their mutual relationship (phase III),
- the question of the role of Paris as a gravitational centre and the emergence and consolidation of the French language (Phase IV).

With respect to the issue of the dialectal basis of French, the same factors are traditionally discussed for Gallo-Romance as for other Romance areas. The bibliography in this field is particularly rich and has brought forth several of the hypotheses on the emergence of Romance before they were applied to the discussion concerning other regions. The substrate-hypothesis (Brun 1936), according to which the essential dialect areas are already delineated by pre-Roman languages, stands alongside the superstrate-hypothesis (Wartburg 1951), which attributes the dialect division primarily to the various Germanic conquests. Moreover, the role of other factors such as the Roman provincial divisions (Merlo 1941), the medieval limits of church administrative areas (Morf 1911) and transportation routes (Lüdtke apud Kontzi 1982) is stressed. All of these influencing factors were certainly more or less important, and it would be wrong to give priority to any mono-causal explanation. It can even be said that the various influences determine each other to a certain extent. Thus, the Roman administrative units were supposedly based at least partially on existing geographic and ethnic boundaries, and there is a further link between these, the Germanic areas of settlement and the medieval diocesan boundaries⁶.

The two main factors in establishing an overall division of the Gallo-Romance area are the far more intensive and continuous romanisation of the south and the deeper germanisation of the north; the reconstruction of further sub-areas is generally a more difficult task. As in other areas, it also appears to be possible to draw conclusions about medieval linguistic geography from the current dialectal situation in certain areas. In other areas, however, due to the spread of the French standard language, strong substitution or convergence processes occurred, resulting in the partial loss of the dialect contours. This is particularly the case in the Ile-de-France and surrounding areas, above all in Champagne, Burgundy and Franche-Comté. Closer to the Occitan border, dialects such as Poitevin or others are still better preserved, the best preserved being those of the north, with the exception of Anglo-Norman, which has completely, except for relicts on the Channel Islands, disappeared. It is no coincidence that studies of scriptae have been carried out successfully particularly for the north and the north-east.

As regularly occurs in the history of languages, in French, too, many processes appearing to the contemporary observer to be examples of change are in fact indirect consequences of certain historic processes. Thus, something which had been present previously, however hidden, becomes visible. In this manner, the Germanic conquest is frequently said to be the

⁶ A good example for this mutual influence is the coincidence in Normandy of the borders of the episcopacy of Rouen on the one hand, and the limits of the second administrative area of the Roman province of Lugdunum on the other hand.

reason for the dialectalisation of France, although it should rather be assumed that the most important consequence of germanisation was the loss of a certain previous superficial unity and in turn the surface appearance of a pre-existent heterogeneity (Wüest 1979, 343). For the general division of the Gallo-Romance area into a southern and a northern area, Wüest (1979, 354ff.) cites a series of geographic factors which favoured different tendencies in settlement or certain contact situations. In the north, the dialect areas had already been formed in the Merovingian period (448-751), long before the appearance of the first written documents; namely Francien in the centre, Walloon, Picard and Norman in the north, Bourguignon, Champenois and Lorrain in the east, and Angevin, Poitevin and Berrichon in the south. There is a dialect-continuum that borders with Occitan in the south and with the Franco-Provençal dialects in the south-east (Lyonnais, Franc-Comtois, Romand, Savoyard and Dauphinois, cf. Vurpas 1995). According to Remacle (1948, 141), the basic dialect division was established in the ninth century, and the dialect boundaries were further shaped during the following centuries.

It is debated whether supra-regionality is already observable in the first sporadic written evidence (Phase II) and to what extent these texts indicate existing Romance written traditions. This has been discussed in most detail with reference to the French passage of the Strasbourg Oaths of 842, generally considered to be the oldest French text. As in the case of other Romance texts from this period, the oath is reproduced in a chronicle in its 'original version' to reflect the authenticity of the eye-witness' report. The main problem with this text is not the question of the authenticity of the copy in the manuscript dating from the tenth century, but far more the fact that it might possibly not be an authentic repetition, but rather a historiographic stylisation of the Romance language. The chronicler Neithard, a grandson of Charles the Great, wanted to create, above all, a kind of mimesis of the vernacular language, and not an authentic report, as has been stressed repeatedly (McKitterick 1991). This is why we should question whether attempts to localise the language of the Oath are really promising. Furthermore, the text is marked by formulaic expressions from the language of Latin documents and by the written style of Merovingian Latin (Ewald 1964). It has been considered possible far more easily to fix the geographical origin of the Eulalia Sequence, which, as the oldest literary French text, dates from the end of the ninth century. It stems from the area of Hucbald de Saint-Amand in Stand-Armand des Eaux, in the Picardian-Wallonian area. Hilty (1973), arguing against the common assumption that writers initially simply wrote in their local dialects, attempted to demonstrate that the presence of glide consonants (*voldret*, *voldrent*, *sostendreiet*) in the Eulalia Sequence, as in the Strasbourg Oaths (*sendra*) represents

a central French characteristic and that thus, even in the very first written texts, not only the locality of a particular dialect but also supra-regional tendencies can be found.

Referring to the dialectal studies of the ALF and all French documents from the period before 1200, Pfister (1973) compares the 20th century dialectal situation with the medieval written documents. For the period between the sixth and the ninth centuries, he assumes that there were various innovations originating from a central French area. These innovations (such as the spread of $u > \ddot{u}$, $a > ae$, $iei > i$) reached some peripheral areas but not others, leading to an isolation of the latter. Pfister doubts that these innovations are due to spreading from the city of Paris. To a certain extent it is assumed that Paris, due to its central position, had developed into an influential centre at an early stage, but a distinction must be made between Paris and the area surrounding the City, the Ile-de-France, where cultural centres had in fact been established in a very early period. Documents from Bourges, Angers, Tours, Paris and Orléans dating from the sixth and seventh centuries are available (Pfister 1973, 251), yet the production of texts written directly in Paris appears to be minimal in the Merovingian period, and there are absolutely no written texts from Paris dating from the Carolingian period. Even the Abbey of St. Denis near Paris, founded in the seventh century, appears to have only acquired supra-regional importance in the twelfth century. Furthermore, Lodge (1993, 102) mentions the strategically unsuitable position which made Paris vulnerable to sea attacks by the Vikings as an argument against the city's having an early leading function. After the supposed initial period of central French innovation, the centre of innovation shifted between the ninth and the twelfth centuries to the Picardian-Flandric-Wallonian area, where important cultural centres were settled (Corbie, Saint-Riquier, Saint Amand, Laon) and important scholars were active. The written innovations of this period also took effect in Paris (spread of the glide consonants b and d , change of $ei > oi$ and of $ou > eu$, Pfister 1973). Only as Paris became an undisputed centre of radiation from the second half of the twelfth century onwards did these innovations spread secondarily. Paris became a source of radiation for both central and northern innovations. The first meta-linguistic evidence of the significance of the language of Paris is documented at the end of the twelfth century, when the Picardian poet Conon de Béthune reports that he was mocked in Paris because of his provincial accent (Brunot 1906/1966, 329). Later on, praise of the characteristics of Parisian language is more frequent, although such meta-linguistic comments generally lag behind the genuine linguistic evolution. Nevertheless, the actual force of Paris' radiation does not appear to have begun much earlier than the time of Philippe Auguste. The meta-linguistic comments also show that indirect signs of linguistic developments visible in the spread of certain graphemes might in

fact correlate with spoken phenomena, even if only the spoken language of a very specific and restricted class was affected.

It was the 12th century with its radical changes that enabled Paris to become an undisputed centre. During this century, the city's population grew exponentially, and Paris became the most influential urban centre in Northern Europe; trade flourished and important clerical centres were established. The relocation of the royal residence to St. Denis in the first third of the twelfth century appears to have been a consequence rather than a trigger, but in being elevated to the capital city, Paris' clearly central role was consolidated. Paris also became the seat of Europe's most important university alongside Bologna. Thus, the city concentrated the different elements which characterised a 'modern' metropolis in the twelfth century: it was a trade centre, a political centre, and it possessed a sufficient cultural (monastic) basis for the more secular society of the thirteenth century to build upon - the century during which the language of Paris began its expansion beyond the confines of the city.

In the course of a general growth in text production in the thirteenth century, regular Romance text production marks the beginning of the third phase in different areas of northern France (Frank/Hartmann 1997, IV):

- from 1246 on in Normandy
- from the beginning of the 13th century in western France
- from 1241 on in the Ile-de-France
- from the end of the twelfth century in Picardy
- from 1233 on in Wallony
- from 1219 on in Lorraine
- from 1228 on in Champagne
- from 1233 on in Burgundy

Before 1250, text production is still sporadic in some areas, whereas in Picardy, Lorraine and Champagne, extensive document series are already available. The documents display, on the one hand, scripta phenomena which partially appear to be linked to the local dialects. On the other hand, it is striking that even from the beginning of extensive Romance text production, tendencies towards convergence can be observed. In different areas, these tendencies reveal, to varying degrees, alignment of regional orthographic conventions with those of regional centres or with the central written forms of the Ile-de-France, as may be observed from instances of hypercorrection (cf. Remacle 1948, Gossen 1967, Goebel 1970). It has been observed that the convergence tendencies do not appear in the sense of positively attested adoptions of Parisian writing traditions, but rather in an avoidance of scriptural habits

perceived or marked as local (Voßler 1929, 27). In this context, it is important to stress the differences in the communicative range of the documents, particularly visible in the case of the contrast between local originals and their copies with supra-regional scope. In the case of the Norman form *rei / rey*, in contrast to the central form *roy*, Goebl (1975, 184ff.) provides an example of a virtually linear loss of the regional form in original documents as well as in copies between 1246 and 1551.

The expansion of Francien is also supported by political events: in 1284, the province Champagne was incorporated into the area of the crown, and shortly afterwards, the economic importance of the Picardian cities began to decline.

From the end of the twelfth century on, and particularly in the course of the thirteenth century, large, elaborated literary texts belonging to the fourth phase begin to appear. This is initially the case in Picardy, Normandy, England and Champagne but then, in the thirteenth century, also in Paris, which gradually developed into a literary centre. However, this occurred earlier in other regions, whose literary prestige kept radiating outwards to the Ile-de-France well into the thirteenth century. In this context, we can speak of the Franco-Picardian scriptae, as even the texts produced in Paris display a Picardian bias. The language of Paris appears first to have functioned as a supra-regional standard pronunciation and only later on to have gradually come to be an orthographic norm. Recent interpretations of the role of the language of Paris which have recourse to the terminology of variationist linguistics have attempted to shed more light on the relationship between Paris and the surrounding areas (cf. Völker 2001a). At the beginning of the Hundred Years' War in 1328, which caused a complete change in French society as it led to the collapse of regional feudalism and to its replacement by a centralised monarchy and a horizontal political structure, Paris was already the undisputed centre of the written and spoken French norm. Its supra-regional radiating effect was even further enforced as a result of the war and its consequences.

In 1539, the French scriptae lose their mixed nature, as the official language of Paris becomes obligatory in all legal documents in France. The language of Paris, which had been a point of orientation for French koineisation since the twelfth century, would repeatedly undergo radical changes in the following centuries. However, Paris remained the linguistic centre of gravity; it is here where the discussions about the standard language in the sixteenth and seventeenth century and the subsequent establishment of *bon usage* as a measure of normative-linguistic orientation would take place; in Paris, the centre of the French koiné becomes equated with a particular style of certain urban classes, and the standardisation of

orthography is equated with the Parisian French Academy – a situation that continues until the present day.

3.2.2. Occitan

The impression that the Gallo-Romance dialect-continuum is divided in two is justified when viewed with hindsight; there are, in fact, some early indications of certain distinctions between the northern and the southern French dialects, while transitions are also revealed. Gascon, which to some extent displays Ibero-Romance characteristics, may be included among the Occitan dialects (Limousin, Auvergnat, Béarnais, Languedocien and Provençal). As was the case for the northern French area, a relatively early establishment of the most important dialectal boundaries may also be assumed for southern France. There are, however, various fundamental differences with respect to the north. Firstly, Occitan is the oldest Romance written language from a purely chronological point of view - not in terms of sporadic evidence from the second phase, but in terms of the first text series (phase III) and with reference to the first elaborated texts in Romance (Phase IV). Secondly, Occitan is, compared to French, a language with a low degree of dialectal differentiation and with a high degree of uniformity in its orthography. Thirdly, in the Occitan area there is no clearly recognizable, urban political centre of linguistic gravitation. Finally, the development of a uniform Occitan koiné is interrupted as early as the thirteenth century and has ended permanently by the sixteenth century.

Occitan is found as a written language in documents as early as at the end of the eleventh century (Brunel 1926, Frank/Hartmann 1997, IV 347ff.). The oldest documents stem from military orders, the Templars and the Johannites, in Albi and Rouergue. In the first documents, which are mostly wills or feudal oaths, Occitan may be found in free sections alongside Latin passages. Texts which are Occitan even in the formulaic parts are, however, found very early. It is striking that even the early documents partly employ quite uniform written forms. This can be explained by the fact that writing was restricted to just a few monastic centres which were in contact with one another and that there were only few discourse traditions. Bec (1986) establishes that the uniformity of the language is greater in the twelfth and thirteenth century than in the fourteenth century, and that in the Occitan area, in contrast to northern France, there was increasing dialectalisation. This can be linked to the aforementioned lack of a centre and to the decadence of the Occitan nobility following the Albigensian crusades in the thirteenth century. The language of the Occitan documents differs

from the texts of Béarn, whose capital was Pau. According to Bec (1986, 71), the other areas, Quercy, Rouergue and Albi, developed a "koiné administrative" very early on, although its existence is doubted by others (Gleßgen/Pfister 1995, 410). The main characteristic of the Old-Occitan documents is their dialectism (cf. also Grafström 1958), which indeed even increased in later periods. The most important urban centre of Occitan is Toulouse, the former Western-Gothic capital.

Besides being the first Romance language exhaustively used in juridical documents, the Occitan area gave rise to the first literary Romance koiné. Supposedly, the language of the troubadors corresponded to an ancient oral tradition. The first known testimony of this tradition can be found in the first troubador, William of Aquitaine (Pfister 1970). The language of the troubadors displays a certain uniformity due to the wide distribution of the texts and melodies (northern France, Germany, Italy) and the fact that the different generations of troubadors always referred to one another and that their texts are closely woven together inter-textually (Gruber 1983, Paden 1998). However, closer examination reveals internal differences, regional features and, partly, northern French trouvère-influences in the case of individual troubadors (Pfister 1976). The language of the troubadors is also the first Romance literary language described in didactic texts as early as in the thirteenth century. *Lo donatz proensals* by Uc Faïdit and *Las razós de trobar* by Raimon Vidal constitute the oldest evidence of Romance grammaticography. They were used in the teaching of Occitan to give foreigners access to Occitan poetry. The *Donatz* addressed an Italian audience and the *Razós* a Catalan audience. Occitan grammaticography reached its height in the country itself in the fourteenth century, when the Toulousian *Leys d'amors*, an admirable text describing the language, appeared. In contrast to the *Donatz proensals*, which depends strongly on the Latin *Donat*, this is a genuinely independent work which applies the terminology of Roman law to language description. The *Leys d'amors* contains a detailed description of Occitan, including interesting observations concerning pronunciation. It should also be mentioned that the work came into being in an urban, bourgeois environment (Coseriu/Meisterfeld 2003, 31-49).

The Occitan language area is equally a precursor for the fourth phase: it was here that the first extensive legal prose text in Romance was written between 1149 and 1170, the legal summa *Lo codi*, which summarises the Justinian laws of the Codex Iuris Civilis in a vernacular version (Derrer 1974). It is generally assumed today that *Lo codi* is not an isolated work but that it stems from an important southern French school of law that flourished in the middle of the twelfth century, with centres in Arles, Valence and St. Gilles, producing important Latin works on Roman law as well, such as the so-called *Summa Trecensis* which served as a model

for the Occitan *Codi* (cf. Gouron 1978 and 1984). This school is often described as the ‘Valence School’, but its precise location remains unclear (Weimar 1972, 24; Gouron 1978, 113). The text of *Lo codi* is not the result of a gradual process of replacing Latin, as is the case for the legal documents, but rather it reflects an elaborate process of vernacular writing which came ‘from above’ and was only able to become established in a highly-educated, Latinate juridical environment. Pfister (1978) attempted to scriptologically situate the manuscript A of the *Codi* which dates from the twelfth century. *Lo codi* is an outstanding example of the European nature of early elaborated Romance writings: In the mid-twelfth century, there was a rapid spread of Roman law throughout the whole of Europe, due to its connection with canon law, as laid out in Gratian’s *Decretum*. Thus, *Lo codi* was created at a time when Roman law was not only an object of study for legal scholars in the newly established university domain, but at a time in which it was also being practically applied as a ‘new’ and adequate law for the rising trade, for the cities and the centralised power structures. Therefore, vernacular versions summarising the new law were needed in different European regions from the end of the twelfth, and above all the thirteenth century onwards. *Lo codi* appears to be an isolated case in the history of Occitan, however the text was translated into numerous languages. Hence, various Old-French versions of this text are known as well as several Occitan manuscripts, a translation back into Latin originating from Italy, a Franco-provençal and a Castilian translation. A Catalan version probably existed but is no longer available. Influences of this text can be found in various *coutumiers* in northern France and in Romance legal writings from the Iberian Peninsula and Italy (Kabatek 2000a, 2005a). The extensive spread of the text also attests contact between vernacular writing traditions.

In summary, the Occitan language area reveals itself as having played a leading role in the establishment of Romance writing traditions and in their unification. Yet within the Occitan area, these innovations have no continuity. The Albigensian wars in the thirteenth century weaken the Occitan area not only politically but also pertaining to its autochthonous language. The final suppression of Occitan is completed in the sixteenth century with the officialisation of French under François I. The lack of certain discourse traditions in Occitan (Gleißgen/Pfister 1995, 406f.) as well as the lack of a spoken koiné correlates with the inexistence of a unified literary language. Only in the 19th century did the Romantic Occitanist movement attempt once more to unify the literary language. Such attempts have remained marginal up to the present day. The most significant effect of the Occitan innovations for later periods is seen in other areas; namely in the way in which Occitan served as a model for written Romance in Northern France, Italy and on the Iberian Peninsula. It is

not only the general tradition of writing legal documents in the vernacular that emerges from the Occitan area; one can even observe an export of concrete linguistic elements. The first Romance poetic tradition started here and spread far beyond the south of France, setting a precedent for the emergence of regional literary languages in many places. It is also from this area that the first Romance prose production originates, representing the first stage in the development of an elaborated Romance vernacular tradition.

3.3. Ibero-Romance

When we look at Ibero-Romance, some general observations can first be made before looking at the three main blocks in detail: Catalan, Castilian (including Navarrese, Aragonese and Leonese) and Galician-Portuguese. For Hispanic Latin, the basis of the Ibero-Romance languages, a certain inner heterogeneity can be observed and related to the time at which the individual areas were romanised and to the Latin of the romanisers, e.g. when we compare the language of the Andalusian patrician colonies with that of the Greek-Roman traders on the east coast (Meier 1930). After the various waves of Germanic invasions, the political unification achieved by the Latinised Western-Goths in 585, with Toledo as their capital, could probably have provided a basis for linguistic unification, if the Arab conquest of 711 had not led to political fragmentation, with individual Christian nuclei in the north presenting an obstacle to a large Arab ruled area. Such nuclei were the Spanish Mark in the east, then Aragon and Navarra and, in the west, Asturias and Galicia. Asturias soon enlarged its territory and became the kingdom of León, which included the county of Castile in its process of emancipation. For the Iberian Peninsula, new linguistic findings in the last decades have led to a more differentiated description of the situation of the proto-Romance first phase before the eleventh century (Díaz y Díaz 1978, 1996, 1998). The basic principle applying to the entire peninsula is that of territorial expansion from the north to the south, as part of the Christian conquest of the Arab areas corresponds with linguistic spread of the northern dialects to the south: Galician to Portugal, Leonese to Extremadura, Castilian to the centre and to Andalusia, Aragonese to Murcia and Catalan down to Valencia (Tuten 2003, Cano Aguilar 2005). Complementarily to the ‘axe-shaped’ spread of Castilian from the north to the south during the *Reconquista* (Menéndez Pidal 1926, 513), the influence of Castilian also spread out to the south like a fan (Vendryes 1923, 291). Thus, it was Castilian, the dialect of the centre, which broke up the linguistic similarity between the dialects of the east and west and which, through its relative distinctiveness, substantially contributed to the later picture of the

linguistic heterogeneity of the Iberian Peninsular (cf. also Lleal 1990, Torres Montes 2006). In this section, the discussion must be restricted to a few brief observations concerning Catalan and Castilian as well as Galician and Portuguese. Navarro-Aragonese (Menéndez Pidal 1926, 460-472, Alvar 1953, Martín Zorraquino 2000), together with Leonese, represents a continuation of a certain linguistic unity from the Western-Gothic period. Within the Navarro-Aragonese language area, the important Rioja monasteries, above all San Millán de la Cogolla, assume a special position due to their supra-regional significance. This is where the first Romance texts belonging to the second phase are found. A considerable number of early Latin texts with numerous Romance characteristics can be found in the Leonese area, which made Menéndez Pidal (1926, 454-460) assume that there was a triglossic situation, in which spoken Romance coexisted alongside 'Leonese Vulgar Latin' and scholarly Latin. Wright (1982) disputes this claim and classifies Leonese Vulgar Latin as written Romance dating from the time before the Clunic reform of pronunciation and orthography.

3.3.1. Catalan

Catalan, described as a bridging language, due to its linguistic proximity to both Gallo-Romance and Ibero-Romance (Baldinger 1971, 125ff.), is, more than Castilian, aligned in a Romance continuum covering both sides of the Pyrenees. Throughout the entire Middle Ages, Catalan is closely linked to the south of France and to influences from other Mediterranean areas. Its linguistic proximity to Occitan is attested from the earliest written evidence onwards. The political centre of Catalonia is the capital city of the county of Barcelona, which has remained a centre of linguistic gravitation up to the present. After the conquest of the kingdom of Valencia, a further centre of gravitation was established, whose linguistic rivalry with Barcelona became apparent at a later time, for example in the conflict on the name of the language (Colon 1978, Eberenz 1989).

Statements claiming that a large degree of uniformity characterises the even first written texts within the Catalan language area (Coromines 1974, 270) stand in contrast to the present-day dialect diversity (Veny 1985, 31ff.), hardly attributable only to developments after the medieval period. The most important dialect boundary is the one between East and West Catalan, which corresponds to a line leading northwards from the west of Tarragona, and according to which the dialect of Barcelona and its surrounding area, including North Catalan in Roussillon, Tarragona and the Balearics (Catalan in Sardinia changed in many respects due to contact with Spanish, Sardinian and finally Italian in the centuries after the conquest), is

classed as East Catalan, whereas the dialects of Lleida and Tortosa up to Valencia belong to West Catalan. The relatively uniform medieval literary language does not necessarily contradict the fact that the principal dialect areas were already established in the first phase, i.e. in the High Middle Ages. Badia i Margarit (1981) considers a combination of sub-stratal effects and Arabic super-stratal effects to be responsible for the dialect division. West Catalan is said to have been more strongly influenced by the pre-Roman substratum than East Catalan, and the Arab conquest is said to have had a considerably lesser effect on North (respectively East) Catalan than on South (respectively West) Catalan. In contrast, Blasco Ferrer (1995b, 1995c) judges the main reasons for the dialectal differences to be re-settlement, the different Latin bases and the diocesan divisions with their correspondingly different cultural development. In contrast to the idea of uniformity, he identifies two scriptae which largely concur with the later dialect areas and which can be clearly differentiated in the texts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries on the basis of a scriptological study of non-literary texts. In the case of the first sporadic texts (phase II, for example *Homilies d'Organyà* at the end of the 12th century), some solutions for Catalan phonemes indicate an already existing tradition. In the initial phase of the development of regional text series (phase III), restricted areas may still be singled out (Mallorquine vs. Rossellonese vs. Valencian vs. central scripta), but a differentiation of two main blocks soon emerges, the influence of Barcelona becoming increasingly evident. In the fourteenth century, standardising tendencies of a uniform official language can be discerned in Barcelona (above all under Peter III, 1336-1387). After the death of Martin the Human (1410), the chancellery moves to Valencia, adopting the unified official language of Barcelona without modifications; older texts are partially brought into line in adaptations, and the abundance of synonyms in earlier texts, which indicated the co-presence of different varieties, is reduced as a result of a conscious concern for linguistic purity (Blasco Ferrer 1995b, 480ff.). Parallel to the development of the language of legal documents, from the thirteenth century onwards an important juridical tradition of prose texts emerges, due to the catalanisation of Roman law (*Costums de Tortosa*, *Furs de Valencia* etc.) and in the writings of Raimundus Lullus. The lexicon and the spectrum of linking techniques is extended, and polymorphism is dispensed with, so that the Catalan written language achieves a high degree of independence with respect to the Latin models.

This uniformity of the written language does, however, not last long and has no counterpart in the spoken language or in the linguistic consciousness. The coexistence of different centres of radiation and the lack of political unity serve to keep the debate on Catalan koineisation lively right up to the present day.

Recent research into Catalan has, to some extent, demystified its linguistic history. Claims made in the Spirit of nation building at the beginning of the twentieth century that Catalan had already achieved the status of an official or even a national language at the time of Jacob I (1213-1276) contradict the clear findings which show that the Catalan text production was minimal in comparison with that of Latin texts (Philipp-Sattel 1996, 10ff.). This is the case despite the fact that the political and cultural significance of Jacob I, under whose leadership important, predominantly legal, Catalan texts were produced, should not be denied. It is above all in popular scientific discussions in Catalonia that claims may be found according to which Catalan was a ‘completely standardised’ language as early as in the thirteenth century. Irrespective of the rather vague definition of the term ‘standardised’, such claims are disproved by historical findings and more often have the aim of substantiating current demands rather than of accurately portraying the diachronic situation.

3.3.2. Castilian

If Castilian is singled out when describing the central area of the mentioned three-way division of Ibero-Romance, this is not because of an anachronic view from the perspective of a much later established unified Spanish language but rather because of the fact that the expansion of Castilian takes place in the entire central area (and in part beyond) in the period being considered, even though other dialects such as Leonese or Navarrese were far more significant in earlier periods. It has already been said that the most important distinction on the Iberian Peninsula is that between the dialects in the north from east to west. During the Reconquista, an additional distinction arises, namely that of the north-south direction, with mutual influence and levelling among the dialects spreading southwards, whilst the archaic forms of the dialects in the northern mountains are less, or even scarcely, affected by these changes (Kabatek 2007).

Several problems arise when reconstructing the linguistic situation and convergence processes of the central area of the Iberian Peninsula during the Middle Ages. Although it may be assumed for certain areas, above all those of the archaic northern dialects (while these still exist), that there is a close link between modern day dialect spaces and medieval linguistic geography as in other Romance areas, this is far less and sometimes probably not at all the case in other areas, namely in the case of the dialects which were eclipsed by the spread of Castilian from the thirteenth century (and above all from the fifteenth century) on, or which only acquired their later form as a result of migration and contact in the course of the

Reconquista. A further problem arises from the question of the link between regional written production and regional dialect, since the Iberian Peninsula was marked by a high degree of mobility during the Middle Ages, with several linguistic consequences. Thus, Catalan was sometimes spoken and written in Aragon and there were French colonies along the Way of St. James, in which Occitan or Occitan-Spanish mixed forms were written (Beltrán 2005), and in the Riojan monasteries there was a massive influence of Mozarabs from the south, whose Romance dialect can only be partly reconstructed.

In the case of Spanish, as a result of the studies carried out by Ramón Menéndez Pidal, a precursor of scripta research has been in existence since the 1920s, far longer than for the Gallo-Romance area. This work takes a comparably modern approach and includes the differentiation of several varieties, a clear-cut division between orthography and pronunciation and, above all, the combination of a geographic-linguistic approach with the rigorous study of non-literary documents, analysis of the historic background and consideration of centres of linguistic radiation. This gave Spanish Medieval Studies a certain methodological lead over other areas. From a contemporary perspective, these predominantly qualitative analyses should be further enhanced by quantitative analyses, the requirements for which are well met by the existence of reliable editions of original documents. The region has also been well studied from a dialectological perspective, including regional studies (cf. the research report provided in Alvar 1996). Certain evolutions, such as the increasing castilianisation of the neighbouring dialects, have been profoundly attested by detailed studies of texts, including consideration of the importance of institutions and centres, which permit at least indirect conclusions concerning linguistic changes of gravitation to be drawn.

Castilian, the language of the Iberian Peninsula which has the greatest significance from a later viewpoint, grew out of a dialect which was initially only spoken in a small area in the Cantabrian mountains belonging to the kingdom of León. In the case of Castilian, the close relationship between koineisation, unification of writing and the expansion of domains of political power can be seen particularly clearly.

Spanish historiography traditionally exaggerated the particular role assumed by Castile within the areas of the north when it said that Castile had very early, already under Count Fernán González in the tenth century, become the most important power of the Reconquista. The image of the 'revolutionary nature' of Castile was also transferred to the language (Menéndez Pidal 2005, 359-363). It repeatedly seems as if the particular character of Castilian, in contrast to the neighbouring dialects, almost predestined it to take the leading role on the Iberian Peninsula. Castilian indeed displays a range of characteristics which distinguish it from

neighbouring dialects (diphthongisation from *o* > *ue* and *e* > *ie*, as was also the case in Aragonese and Leonese, but in contrast to Galician-Portuguese and Catalan; change of *f* > *h* etc.). However, it seems highly doubtful that language-internal criteria are responsible for the territorial ascent of Castilian; the explanation is rather to be sought in political-historical reasons. Furthermore, the highlighting of a special position of Castile before the eleventh century can be proven to be a belated myth; Castile was nothing more than the relatively sparsely populated eastern part of the kingdom of León, marked by territorial battles. The stressing of its supposed special status in the ninth century actually dates largely from the thirteenth century, a time in which such a supremacy really did exist and a moment when a kind of national history is, to some extent, retrospectively created (Kabatek 1999b).

The first urban centre of radiation of Castilian was Burgos, where different influences from the surrounding area converged (Menéndez Pidal 1926, 485-489, Lapesa 1989, 182, Tuten 2003, 94-144). The most important centres of writing in the eleventh and twelfth centuries are the monasteries along the Way of St. James, above all San Millán de la Cogolla, Santo Domingo de Silos and the Galician city of Compostela. Following the conquest of Toledo (1085), an antagonism grew between Burgos and Toledo, the effects of which left historical linguistic traces into the sixteenth century. Burgos rapidly gained significance after the Castilian conquest, with domination of the local nobility and the local dialect. Toledo, the former Western-Gothic capital, in contrast, had a long and complex tradition and consisted of a rather heterogeneous population of Mozarabs, Leonese, Franks, Castilians, Moors and Jews. Linguistically, it was characterised by a mixture of different varieties and soon achieved supra-regional significance. The antagonism between the two centres is evident in the political domain (regional minor nobility in Burgos, royal power in Toledo) as well as in the juridical domain (customary law in Burgos, written law in Toledo) and can certainly be extended to the linguistic situation (Kabatek 1999a, Tuten 2003, 94-144).

After the first sporadic evidence from the eleventh and twelfth centuries (for discussion see Wright 1982, Quilis 1999, Tuten 2003), Castilian enters the third phase of our model in the thirteenth century. From around 1220 on, the first document series are found (Menéndez Pidal 1919). During the first half of the thirteenth century, a 'more conservative', latinising current competes with an innovative, castilianising tendency in Toledo (Wright 2001). Under Fernando III, Castilian becomes the language of the royal chancellery, and Toledo, as the seat of the chancellery linked to the archbishopric, becomes the centre of the Castilian scripta, whose influence can soon be observed in documents and legal charters throughout the entire Iberian Peninsula. There has been a lengthy debate on whether the language of Toledo was

imposed by decree as a norm for Castile (González Ollé 1996), but such a royal decree supposedly issued by Alphonse the Wise appears to have been a later invention. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as the dialects from Seville and from Old-Castile competed to become the Castilian norm, the alleged decree was brought out as proof of the excellence of the Toledo norm.

The fourth phase was achieved in Castile under Alphonse the Wise. Castilian became the language of prose works in various domains (Gómez Redondo 1998), including extensive historiographic, legal and scientific texts. The creation of these works required new clause-linking techniques and extension of the vocabulary. The criteria for the elaboration are supposed to have stemmed from personal intervention of the monarch himself (Solalinde 1915), as is stated in the works. It remains disputed to what extent this is a reflex of stylisation or of the inclusion of references intended to give an aura of authority. The criteria for the creation of written Castilian included, amongst others, the rejection of a latinising, provençalising or arabising language and the attempt of creating new expressions by employing the possibilities of Castilian word formation, even in the case of scientific or legal terminology (cf. Niederehe 1975, Bossong 1979). The Alphonsine writing traditions remained the model for the whole of Castile and for supra-regional correspondence throughout the entire Iberian Peninsula right into the fourteenth century. Parallel to this language, a Toledian spoken norm existed, which however lost its significance when the capital city was moved in the sixteenth century (provisionally to Valladolid and then definitively to Madrid) and the language of Old-Castilian again took on the leading role (Menéndez Pidal 1962).

3.3.3. Galician and Portuguese

In the field of research on Galician and Portuguese, there is also a lack of extensive scriptological studies comparable to those conducted for France, as is the case for the other Ibero-Romance areas (cf. with respect to this Monjour 1995). However, in recent decades, considerable advances have been made in terms of the quantity of edited texts and their respective exploration. Among others, the studies conducted by Lorenzo (1975) Maia (1986) and Martins (1994) are worthy of particular mention (see the overview by Mariño 2008).

The crucial question about Galician and Portuguese from the Middle Ages until the present is that of the unity or diversity of the language area; the question whether Galician-Portuguese is a rather uniform language or if there are more or less striking differences between Galician and Portuguese even in this early period. Different phenomena must be distinguished in this

context: firstly, the problem of written uniformity must be differentiated from that of spoken uniformity, and within written language, uniformity of literary and non-literary texts must be distinguished. For the spoken language, the question is whether the moment when Galician and Portuguese become separated entities can be fixed, and which factors should be seen as responsible for this separation. An initial diachronic difference can be established between the emergence of the Romance dialects and their expansion due to political factors. Whilst the Romance dialects south of the Minho were overshadowed by Arabic after the Arab conquest of 711, in the north, a primary Romance dialect could develop, which was named Galician as a derivation from the Romance province name *Callaecia*. During the Reconquista, the area of Galician dominance spread further south. Following the conquest of Toledo in 1085, as a sign of gratitude for the help by the French knights, and in particular as a tribute to the Abbot of Cluny, Alphonse VI of Castile married his step-daughter Teresa to Henry of Burgundy, whom he allowed to govern the area south of the Minho (from 1095 as *Condado de Portugal*). The presumed nephew of Henry, Raimundo, married the king's daughter, Urraca, and ruled Galicia with her. After the death of Alphonse VI in 1109, Urraca's and Raimundo's son became the king of León and Castile. Galicia orientated itself towards the centre, whilst Henry of Portugal laid the foundation for the separation of Portugal from León, which was finally achieved by his son Afonso Henriques (later Alphonse I of Portugal) after several attempts and through skilful diplomacy (particularly towards Rome). In 1131, the monastery of Santa Cruz was founded in Coimbra. Following the battle of Ourique (on the 25th of July 1140), Afonso Henriques became king, and Portugal, to a considerable degree, independent from León and Castile. The most important date in Portugal's development is 1147, when Afonso Henriques conquered the large and culturally flourishing Mozarabian city of Lisbon. With Lisbon, Portugal gained a new urban centre which paved the way for a linguistic orientation away from the north (cf. Neto 1952, 382ff.).

There are two different hypotheses concerning the koineisation tendencies which mirrored these political events, each of them appearing ultimately to correspond to the historical reality. On the one hand, Lisbon is an important centre whose population includes a large proportion of Romance-speaking Mozarabs at the time of the conquest, but on the other hand, the language of the conquerors from the north is Galician. Thus, one can interpret Portuguese as either mozarabised Galician or as galicianised Mozarabic. Contrary to the idea that Galician-Portuguese was originally a unified language, Maia (1986) showed in an extensive study that actual differences between the two varieties were already apparent at the time of the conquest of Lisbon, which makes us conjecture that it was only a question of time before the

conquerors' variety, which originally probably had diastratic and diaphasic prestige, was 'diatopised' and 'archaicised', i.e. before elements of the urban variety of Lisbon were enforced and the northern Galician lost prestige in Lisbon. This "desgalegização", to which grammarians refer from the sixteenth century onwards, appears to have been initiated as early as the twelfth century, according to the estimation of Serafim da Silva Neto (cf. Neto 1952, 1961, Monjour 1995). During the following period, the indisputable political centre Lisbon became the linguistic centre of gravitation for the Portuguese koiné. By contrast, the north was separated from the south, and the Minho increasingly came to be a linguistic boundary. Galician was more and more influenced by Castilian and only far more recently underwent its own koineisation process (Kabatek 1996).

If the differences between Galician and Portuguese in the Middle Ages are highlighted today from a particular differential contemporary perspective, we are evidently dealing with very slight differences that have their counterpart in large areas of identity. Morphologically and syntactically speaking, Galician and Portuguese are so similar even today that one can assume that the differences in the Middle Ages were predominantly lexical and phonetic in nature. When adopting the language of the north, the Mozarabs of Lisbon retained their phonetic habits at least partially, although these can only be hypothetically reconstructed and have no reflection in the written language, since they date from the 'first phase' in which there were no written Romance texts. The first clearly datable, although still isolated, written Romance evidence (phase II) stems from the first half of the thirteenth century. Thus, Galician-Portuguese is a relatively 'late' written Romance language. In the second half of the thirteenth century, Romance scriptae came into being in various monastic centres (phase III). The texts from the northern monasteries display, to some extent, differences in comparison to the texts originating from the southern monasteries (Maia 1986, Monjour 1995, Bello Rivas 2001), but only very vague relationships may be discerned between the orthographic differences and the presumed spoken differences (Börner 1976), especially since the monasteries had very close contact to each another. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, the fourth phase begins, above all as a result of the reception of the Castilian Alphonsine Renaissance brought about by the nephew of Alphonse the Wise, Dom Dinis. With the stabilising of the chancellery language of Lisbon and the introduction of the Provençal graphemes (<lh> and <nh> for [ʎ] and [ɲ], amongst others), the foundation was laid for an independent Portuguese national language. Alphonsine texts, which are in clear contrast to the southern tradition orthographically and in part linguistically, were also translated in Galicia. These texts could

not, however, initiate a lasting tradition there, since an increasingly strong castilianisation asserted itself as a result of political dependencies.

Similar to the case of Occitan, a Galician poetic language with supra-regional significance developed early on, largely independent of the document tradition. The Castilian king Alphonse the Wise is considered to be the most famous Galician poet. With the *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, he produced a significant literary work, whilst also promoting the dissemination of Castilian prose. This is a further example of the compatibility of different written languages for different purposes that was widespread in the Middle Ages (Beltrán 2005).

Three principal goals remain for research into medieval Galician and Portuguese: firstly, the edition of extensive collections of unedited medieval documents, secondly, systematic scriptological analysis of the entire medieval written corpus and thirdly, diachronic interpretation based on such extensive document analysis, including references to historical and other additional information – and the latter to be worked out without any ideologically motivated anachronisms.

4. References

- ALF = Gilliéron, Jules / Edmont, Edmond 1902-20, *Atlas linguistique de la France*, Paris: Champion.
- Alvar, Manuel 1953, *El dialecto aragonés*, Madrid, Gredos.
- ed. 1996, *Manual de dialectología hispánica. El español de España*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- Auer, Peter / Hinskens, Frans / Kerswill, Paul eds. 2005, *Dialect change. Convergence and divergence in European languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Backus, Ad 2004, “Convergence as a mechanism of language change”, *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7:2, 179-181.
- Badía Margarit, Antonio [i.e. Badia i Margarit, Antoni] 1960, ‘Dos tipos de lengua cara a cara’, *Studia Philologica. Homenaje a Dámaso Alonso, I*, Madrid, 115-139.
- 1981, *La formació de la llengua catalana. Assaig d’interpretació històrica*, Barcelona, Abadia de Montserrat.
- Baldinger, Kurt 1958, ‘Die hyperkorrekten Formen als Konsequenz der Scripta im Altgaskognischen’, in Lausberg, Heinrich / Weinrich, Harald eds., *Romanica. Festschrift für Gerhard Rohlf*, Halle, Niemeyer, 57-75.

- 1971, *La formación de los dominios lingüísticos en la Península Ibérica*, 21 ed. corr. y aum., Madrid, Gredos.
- Banniard, Michel 1992, *Viva voce. Communication écrite et communication orale du IV au X siècle en Occident latin*, Paris, Institut des études Augustiniennes.
- 1998, 'Diasystèmes et diachronie langagières du latin parlé tardif au protofrançais IIIe-VIIIe siècles', in Herman 1998, 131-153.
- 2006, 'Délimitation temporelle entre le latin et les langues romanes', in: Ernst/Glessgen/Schmitt/Schweickardt 2006, 544-554.
- Barra Jover, Mario 2008, 'Tradición discursiva, creación y difusión de innovaciones sintácticas: la cohesión de los argumentos nominales a partir del siglo XIII', in: Kabatek 2008, 127-149.
- Bartoli, Matteo 1944-45, 'Sao ko kelle terre...', *Lingua Nostra* 6, 1-6.
- Bec, Pierre 1986, *La langue occitane*, 5e éd. mise à jour, Paris, PUF.
- Bello Rivas, Maria Xesús 1998, 'O texto galego da Crónica General e o seu traductor', in D. Kremer, *Homenaxe a Ramón Lorenzo*, Vigo, Galaxia, 59-69.
- 2001, 'São Vicente de Fora (Lisboa) / Montederramo (Ourense). En torno a la tradición notarial gallego-portuguesa', in Jacob / Kabatek 2001, 45-61.
- Beltran, Vicenç 2005, *La corte de Babel. Lenguas, poética y política en la España del siglo XIII*, Madrid, Gredos.
- Berschin Helmut / Felixberger, Josef / Goebel, Hans 1978, *Französische Sprachgeschichte*, München, Hueber.
- Blasco Ferrer, Eduardo 1984, *Storia linguistica della Sardegna*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- 1993, 'Les plus anciens monuments de la langue sarde. Histoire, genre, description typologique et linguistique', in Selig / Frank / Hartmann 1993, 109-149.
- 1995a, 'Il sardo', in Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1995, 239-271.
- 1995b, 'Katalanische Koine', in Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1995, 473-486.
- 1995c, 'Les scriptae catalanes', in Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1995, 486-512.
- Börner, Wolfgang 1976, *Schriftstruktur und Lautstruktur. Studien zur altgalicischen Skripta*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

- Bonfante, Larissa ed. 1999, *Guliano Bonfante, The Origin of the Romance Languages*, Heidelberg, Winter.
- Bossong, Georg 1979, *Probleme der Übersetzung wissenschaftlicher Werke aus dem Arabischen in das Altspanische zur Zeit Alfons des Weisen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Bruneau, Charles 1955/1969, *Petite histoire de la langue française*, 5e éd., Paris, Colin.
- Brunot, Ferdinand 1905-, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*, Paris, Colin.
- Brunel, Clovis éd. 1926, *Les plus anciennes chartes en langue provençale. Recueil des pièces originales antérieures au XIIIe siècle*, Paris, Auguste Picard 1926.
- Brunot, Ferdinand 1906/1966, *Histoire de la langue française, Vol. I*, Paris, Colin.
- Brun, Auguste 1936, 'Linguistique et peuplement', *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 12, 165-251.
- Buridant, Claude 2000, *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français*, Paris, Sedes.
- Cano Aguilar, Rafael ed. 2004, *Historia de la lengua española*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- Carolus-Barré, Louis 1964, *Les plus anciennes chartes en langue française*, tome 1, *Problèmes généraux et recueil des pièces originales conservées aux archives de l'Oise 1241-1286*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Castellani, Arrigo 1982, *La prosa italiana delle origini. Testi toscani di carattere pratico*, Vol. I, Bologna, Pàtron.
- Cerquiglini, Bernard 1989, *Éloge de la variante. Histoire critique de la philologie*, Paris, Seuil.
- Cintra, L. F. Lindley 1959, *A linguagem dos Foros de Castelo Rodrigo*, Lisboa, Publicações do Centro de Estudos Filológicos.
- Colon, Germà 1978, *La llengua catalana en els seus textos, I*, Barcelona.
- Coseriu, Eugenio 1977, 'Sprachliche Interferenz bei Hochgebildeten', in Kolb, Herbert / Lauffer, Hartmut eds., *Sprachliche Interferenz, Festschrift für Werner Betz*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 77-100.
- 1980, "'Historische Sprache' und 'Dialekt'", in Göschel, J. / Ivic, P. / Kehr, K., *Dialekt und Dialektologie. Ergebnisse des internationalen Symposiums <Zur Theorie des Dialekts>*, Marburg/Lahn 1977, Wiesbaden, Steiner, 106-115.
- 1983, 'Linguistic Change does not exist', *Linguistica Nuova ed Antica* 1, 51-63.

- Coseriu, Eugenio / Meisterfeld, Reinhard 2003, *Geschichte der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. I, *Von den Anfängen bis zum Humanismus*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Dees, Anthonij 1980, *Atlas des formes et des constructions des chartes du 13e siècle*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- 1985, 'Dialectes et scriptae à l'époque de l'ancien français', *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 49, 87-117.
- 1987, *Atlas des formes linguistiques des textes littéraires de l'ancien français*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Derrer, Felix 1974, *Lo Codi. Eine Summa Codicis in provenzalischer Sprache aus dem XII. Jahrhundert. Die provenzalische Fassung der Handschrift A (Sorbonne 632). Vorarbeiten zu einer kritischen Textausgabe*, Zürich, Juris.
- Devoto, Giacomo 1953, *Profilo di storia linguistica italiana*, Firenze, La nuova Italia.
- Díaz y Díaz, Manuel 1978, *Las primeras glosas hispánicas*, Barcelona.
- 1996, 'Las glosas protohispánicas', in *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de Historia de la lengua española*, Salamanca 1996.
- 1998, 'La transición del latín al romance en perspectiva hispana', in Herman 1998, 155-172.
- Eberenz, Rolf 1989, 'Conciencia lingüística y premodernismo en los reinos de la España medieval', in Strosetzki, Christoph / Tietz, Manfred (eds.), *Einheit und Vielfalt der Iberoromania. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Hamburg, Buske, 201-210.
- Ernst, Gerhard / Glessgen, Martin-Dietrich / Schmitt, Christian / Schweickard, Wolfgang (edd.), 2003, *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen / Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Manuel international d'histoire linguistique de la Romania*, vol. I, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter.
- Ernst, Gerhard / Glessgen, Martin-Dietrich / Schmitt, Christian / Schweickard, Wolfgang (edd.), 2006, *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen / Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Manuel international d'histoire linguistique de la Romania*, vol. II, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter.
- Ewald, Konrad 1964, 'Formelhafte Wendungen in den Straßburger Eiden', *Vox Romanica* 23, 35-55.

- Feller, Jules 1931, 'Français et dialectes chez les auteurs belges du moyen Age', *Bulletin de la Commission Royale de Toponymie et de Dialectologie* Bruxelles, 33-92.
- Flydal, Leiv 1951, 'Remarques sur certains rapports entre le style et l'état de langue', *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 16, 240-257.
- Frank, Barbara 1994, *Die Textgestalt als Zeichen. Lateinische Handschriftentradition und die Verschriftlichung der romanischen Sprachen*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Frank, Barbara / Hartmann, Jörg (eds.) 1997, *Inventaire systématique des premiers documents des langues romanes*, 5 vols., Tübingen, Narr.
- Gärtner, Kurt / Holtus, Günter / Rapp, Andrea / Völker, Harald (eds.): *Skripta, Schreiblandschaften und Standardisierungstendenzen. Urkundensprachen im Grenzbereich von Germania und Romania im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Trier, KlioMedia.
- Gimeno Menéndez, Francisco 1995, *Sociolingüística histórica (siglos X-XII)*, Madrid, Visor.
- Gleßgen, Martin-Dietrich / Pfister, Max 1995, 'Okzitanische Koine', in Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1995, 406-412.
- Glessgen, Martin-Dietrich / Lebsanft, Franz (eds.) 1997, *Alte und neue Philologie*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Goebel, Hans 1970, *Die normandische Urkundensprache. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der nordfranzösischen Urkundensprache des Mittelalters*, Wien, Böhlau.
- 1975, 'Le Rey est mort, vive le Roy'. Nouveaux regards sur la scriptologie', *Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature* 13, 145-210.
- 1995, 'Les scriptae françaises III. Normandie', in Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1995, 314-337.
- 2000, 'La dialectométrisation de l'ALF, présentation des premiers résultats', *Linguistica*, (Ljubljana) XL/2, 209-236.
- 2002, 'Analyse dialectométrique des structures de profondeur de l'ALF', *Revue de linguistique romane* 66, 5-63.
- 2003, 'Regards dialectométriques sur les données de l'Atlas linguistique de la France (ALF) : relations quantitatives et structures de profondeur', *Estudis Romànics* 25, 59-96.

- 2006, 'Sur le changement macrolinguistique survenu entre 1300 et 1900 dans le domaine d'oïl. Une étude diachronique d'inspiration dialectométrique', *Linguistica* (Ljubljana) XLVI, 1-37.
- 2007, 'A bunch of dialectometric flowers: a brief introduction to Dialectometry', in Smit, Ute / Dollinger, Stefan / Hüttner, Julia (Kaltenböck, Gunther / Lutzky, Ursula (eds.)), *Tracing English through time*, Wien, Braumüller, 133-171.
- Gómez Redondo, Fernando 1998, *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*, Vol. I, *La creación del discurso prosístico. El entramado cortesano*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- González Ollé, Fernando 1996, *El habla toledana, modelo de la lengua española*, Toledo, Instituto Provincial de Investigaciones y Estudios Toledanos Publicaciones del IPIET, Temas Toledanos, NO 82.
- Gossen, Carl Theodor 1967, *Französische Skriptastudien. Untersuchungen zu den nordfranzösischen Urkundensprachen des Mittelalters*, Wien, Hermann Böhlau Nachf.
- 1968, 'Graphème et Phonème, Le problème central de l'étude des langues écrites du Moyen Age', *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 32, 1-16.
- 1979, 'Méditations scriptologiques', *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, XXII, 263-283.
- 1982, Review of Dees 1980, *Vox Romanica* 41, 273-276.
- Gouron, André 1978, *La science juridique française aux XIe et XIIe siècles. Diffusion du Droit de Justinien et influences canoniques jusqu'à Gratien*, Milano, Giuffrè Ius Romanum Medii Aevi 1, 4, d, e.
- 1985, 'Le manuscrit 632 de la Sorbonne, A la convergence des droits savants en pays d'oc'. in *Mélanges de la Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne*, 6, 6-20.
- Grafström, Ake 1958, *Étude sur la graphie des plus anciennes chartes languedociennes avec un essai d'interprétation phonétique*, Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Gruber, Jörn 1983, *Die Dialektik des Trobar, Untersuchungen zur Struktur und Entwicklung des occitanischen und französischen Minnesangs des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Gsell, Otto 1995, 'Französische Koine', in Holtus/Metzeltin/Schmitt 1995, 271-289.
- Hafner, Jochen / Oesterreicher, Wulf eds. 2007, *Mit Clio im Gespräch. Romanische Sprachgeschichten und Sprachgeschichtsschreibung*, Tübingen, Narr.

- Hartmann, Jörg 1992, *Studien zum: Seneser Schriftgebrauch des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Diss., Universität Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Haskins, Charles Homer 1927, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge/Mass. - London, Harvard University Press.
- Hausmann, Frank-Rutger 1999, ‘‘Anschrren, Furchen, Pflügen, Säen’ - Eine neue Deutung des ‚Indovinello Veronese’, in Nolte, Theodor / Keck, Anna, *Ze hove und an der strazen: die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters und ihr ‚Sitz im Leben’*, Stuttgart, Hirzel, 153-159.
- Herman, József 1990, *Du latin aux langues romanes*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- ed. 1998, *La transizione dal latino alle lingue romanze. Atti della Tavola Rotonda di Linguistica Storica. Università Ca’Foscari di Venezia, 14-15 giugno 1996*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Hilty, Gerold 1973, ‘Les origines de la langue littéraire française’, *Vox Romanica* 32, 254-271.
- Hinskens, Frans / Auer, Peter / Kerswill, Paul 2005, ‘‘The study of dialect convergence and divergence: conceptual and methodological considerations’’, in Auer / Hinskens / Kerswill eds., 1-48.
- Holtus, Günter / Metzeltin Michael / Schmitt, Christian 1995, *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. II, 2, *Die einzelnen romanischen Sprachen und Sprachgebiete vom Mittelalter bis zur Renaissance / Les différentes langues romanes et leurs regions d’implantation du Moyen Age à la Renaissance*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Holtus, Günter / Metzeltin Michael / Schmitt, Christian 1996, *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. II, 1, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Holtus, Günter / Körner, Anja / Völker, Harald 2001, ‘‘Endogene’ und ‘exogene’ Analogien. Hyperkorrektismen und andere Analogiebildungen in den altfranzösischen Urkunden der Grafen von Luxemburg (1237-1281)’, in Henrard, Nadine / Moreno, Paola / ThiryStassin, Martine eds., *Convergences médiévales. Épopée, lyrique, roman. Mélanges offerts à Madeleine Tyssens*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, 257-270.
- Jacob, Daniel / Kabatek, Johannes eds. 2001, *Lengua medieval y tradiciones discursivas en la Península Ibérica: descripción gramatical – pragmática histórica – metodología*, Frankfurt/Madrid, Vervuert.

- Jodl, Frank 2003, *Francia, Langobardia und Ascolis Ladinia: die Bedeutung außersprachlicher Faktoren im Zusammenhang mit innersprachlichen Entwicklungen in drei Teilgebieten der Romania*, Frankfurt, Lang.
- Joseph, John 1980, *The Standard Language. Theory, Dogma and Sociocultural Reality*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.
- 1987, *Eloquence and Power. The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*, London, Frances Pinter.
- Kabatek, Johannes 1996, *Die Sprecher als Linguisten. Interferenz- und Sprachwandelphänomene dargestellt am Galicischen der Gegenwart*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- 1999a, 'Von Burgos nach Toledo, altkastilischer Normenkonflikt und Probleme der Rekonstruktion', in Wesch, Andreas Brumme, Jenny eds., *Normen und Subnormen in Geschichte und Gegenwart - Methoden ihrer Rekonstruktion und Beschreibung*, Wien, Praesens, 115-130.
- 1999b, 'Sobre el nacimiento del castellano desde el espíritu de la oralidad (apuntes acerca de los textos jurídicos castellanos de los siglos XII y XIII)', in Company, Concepción / González, Aurelio / von der Walde Moheno, Lilian eds., *Discursos y representaciones en la Edad Media. Actas de las VI Jornadas Medievales*, México D.F., UNAM - El Colegio de México, 169-187.
- 2000a, 'Lo Codi und die okzitanischen Texttraditionen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert', in Rieger, Angelica ed., *Okzitanistik, Altokzitanistik und Provençalistik. Geschichte und Auftrag einer europäischen Philologie. Akten der gleichnamigen Sektion des Deutschen Romanistentages in Osnabrück 1999*, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 147-163.
- 2000b, 'L'oral et l'écrit – quelques aspects théoriques d'un « nouveau » paradigme dans le canon de la linguistique romane', in: Wolfgang Dahmen, Günter Holtus, Johannes Kramer, Michael Metzeltin, Wolfgang Schweickard, Otto Winkelmann (eds.): *Kanonbildung in der Romanistik und in den Nachbardisziplinen. Romanistisches Kolloquium XIV*, Tübingen, Narr, 305-320.
- 2001, '¿Cómo investigar las tradiciones discursivas medievales? El ejemplo de los textos jurídicos castellanos', in Jacob / Kabatek 2001, 97-132.

- 2005a, *Die Bolognesische Renaissance und der Ausbau romanischer Sprachen. Juristische Diskurstraditionen und Sprachentwicklung in Südfrankreich und Spanien im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- 2005b, 'Tradiciones discursivas y cambio lingüístico', in: *Lexis* 29/2, 151-177.
- 2005c, 'Las tradiciones discursivas del español medieval: historia de textos e historia de la lengua', *Iberoromania* 62, 28-43
- 2007, 'Otra historia de las lenguas ibero-románicas: en torno a la actualidad de una vieja idea', in Hafner / Oesterreicher 2007, 173-194.
- 2008, ed., *Sintaxis histórica del español y cambio lingüístico: Nuevas perspectivas desde las Tradiciones Discursivas*, Frankfurt am Main/Madrid, Vervuert-Iberoamericana.
- Kabatek, Johannes / Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte 2000 'Zu Notwendigkeit und theoretischem Status der Sprachkategorisierungsforschung', *Sociolinguistica* 14 115-120.
- Kloss, Heinz 1987, "Abstandsprache und Ausbausprache", in Ammon, Ulrich / Dittmar, Norbert / Mattheier, Klaus J. (eds.), *Sociolinguistics / Soziolinguistik*, Vol. I, Berlin / New York, De Gruyter, 302-308.
- Koch, Peter 1987, *Distanz im Dictamen. Zur Schriftlichkeit und Pragmatik mittelalterlicher Brief- und Redemodelle in Italien*, Habilitationsschrift, Freiburg im Breisgau.
- 1988, 'Italienisch: Externe Sprachgeschichte I', in Günter Holtus/Michael Metzeltin/Christian Schmitt (eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. IV, Tübingen, Niemeyer 1988, 343-360.
- 1993, 'Pour une typologie conceptionnelle et médiale des plus anciens documents/monuments des langues romanes', in Selig / Frank / Hartmann 1993, 39-8 1.
- 1997, 'Diskurstraditionen: zu ihrem sprachtheoretischen Status und ihrer Dynamik', in Frank, Barbara / Haye, Thomas / Tophinke, Doris eds., *Gattungen mittelalterlicher Schriftlichkeit*, Tübingen, Narr, 43-79.
- 2006, 'Romanische Sprachgeschichte und Varietätenlinguistik', in Ernst/ Glessgen/ Schmitt/ Schweickardt 2003, 102-123.
- Koch, Peter / Oesterreicher, Wulf 1985, 'Sprache der Nähe - Sprache der Distanz. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte', *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 36, 15-43.

- 1994, 'Schriftlichkeit und Sprache', in Günther, Hartmut / Ludwig, Otto eds., *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit. Ein internationales Handbuch / Writing and its Use. An international Handbook*, 2 vols., Berlin/New York De Gruyter, 1, 587-604.
- Kontzi, Reinhold ed. 1982, *Substrate und Superstrate in den romanischen Sprachen*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Krefeld, Thomas 1988, 'Italienisch: Periodisierung', in: Holtus, Günter/Metzeltin, Michael/Schmitt, Christian (eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. IV, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 748-762.
- Labov, William 1975, 'The use of the present to explain the past', in: Heilmann, L. (ed.): *Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Linguistics*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 825-851.
- Lausberg, Heinrich 1963, *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft. 1. Einleitung und Vokalismus*, Berlin, Göschen.
- Lapesa, Rafael 1981, *Historia de la lengua española*, 9th ed. Madrid, Gredos.
- Liver, Ricarda 1995, 'Bündnerromanisch', in Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1995., 68-81.
- Lorenzo, Ramón 1975, *La traducción gallega de la Crónica General y de la Crónica de Castilla*, Orense, Instituto Padre Feijoo.
- Lleal, Coloma 1990, *La formación de las lenguas romances peninsulares*, Barcelona, Barcanova.
- Lodge, R. Anthony 1993, *French. From Dialect to Standard*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Lüdtke, Helmut 1964, 'Die Entstehung romanischer Schriftsprachen', *Vox Romanica* 23, 321.
- Maia, Clarinda de Azevedo 1986, *História do galego-português. Estado linguístico da Galiza e do Noroeste de Portugal desde o século XIII ao século XVI (com referência à situação do galego moderno)*, Coimbra, Instituto nacional de Investigação Científica.
- Maiden, Martin 1995, *A Linguistic History of Italian*, London/New York, Longman.
- Maraschio, Nicoletta 1993, 'Grafia e ortografia, evoluzione e codificazione', in Serianni Trifone 1993, 139-227.
- Mariño, Ramón 2008, *Historia de la lengua gallega*, München, Lincom.
- Martin Zorraquino, Maria Antonia / Enguita Utrilla, José Maria 2000, *Las lenguas de Aragón*, Zaragoza, Caja de Ahorros de la Inmaculada.

- Martins, Ana Maria 1994, *Clíticos na História do português*, Dissertação de Doutorado inédita.
- McKitterick, Rosamond 1991, 'Latin and Romance, an historian's perspective', in Wright 1991, 130-145.
- Meier, Harri 1930, *Beiträge zur sprachlichen Gliederung der Pyrenäenhalbinsel*, Hamburg, Romanisches Seminar.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón ed. 1919, *Documentos lingüísticos de España, I, Reino de Castilla*, Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos.
- 1926/1986, *Orígenes del español. Estado lingüístico de la Península Ibérica hasta el siglo XI*, 10a edición según la tercera muy corregida y adicionada de 1950, Madrid, Espasa Calpe, 1986, 1st ed. Madrid 1926.
- 2005, *Historia de la lengua española*, Madrid, Fundación Menéndez Pidal.
- Merlo, Clemente 1941, *La Francia linguistica odierna e la Gallia di Giulio Cesare*, Roma.
- Miestamo, M. / Sinnemäki, K. / Karlsson, F. eds. 2009, *Language Complexity: Typology, Contact, Change*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Migliorini, Bruno 1961, *Storia della lingua italiana*, Firenze, Sansoni.
- Mioni, Alberto M. 1983, 'Italiano tendenziale. Osservazioni su alcuni aspetti della standardizzazione', in *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, Pisa, Pacini, 495- 517.
- Monfrin Jacques 1968, 'Le mode de tradition des actes écrits et les études de dialectologie', *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 32, 17-47.
- Monjour, Alf 1995, 'Galegische und portugiesische Skriptae', in Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1995, 692-720.
- Morf, Heinrich 1911, *Zur sprachlichen Gliederung Frankreichs*, Berlin.
- Neto, Serafim da Silva 1952, *História da língua portuguesa*, Rio de Janeiro, Livros de Portugal.
- 1961, *A constituição do português como Língua nacional*, Lisboa.
- Niederehe, Hans-Josef 1975, *Die Sprachauffassung Alfons des Weisen: Studien zur Sprach- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

- Oesterreicher, Wulf 1993, 'Verschriftung und Verschriftlichung im Kontext medialer und konzeptioneller Schriftlichkeit', in Ursula Schäfer ed., *Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter*, Tübingen, Narr, 267-292.
- 1997, 'Zur Fundierung von Diskurstraditionen', in Haye, Thomas / Tophinke, Doris eds., *Gattungen mittelalterlicher Schriftlichkeit*, Tübingen, Narr, 19-41.
- 2001, 'La 'recontextualización' de los géneros medievales como tarea hermenéutica', in Jacob/Kabatek 2001, 199-232.
- Paden William D. 1998, *An introduction to Old Occitan*, New York, The Modern Language Association.
- Paul, Hermann 1920, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 5th ed. (1st ed. 1880), Halle, Niemeyer.
- Petrucchi, Armando / Romeo, Carlo 1992, *Scriptores in urbibus*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Pfister, Max 1970, 'Die Anfänge der altprovenzalischen Schriftsprache', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 86, 305-323.
- 1973, 'Die sprachliche Bedeutung von Paris und der Ile-de-France vor dem 13. Jahrhundert', *Vox Romanica* 32, 217-253.
- 1976, 'La langue de Guilhem IX, comte de Poitiers', *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 19, 91-113.
- 1978, 'La localisation d'une scripta juridique en ancien occitan, *Lo Codi* manuscrit A, Sorbonne 632', in Güntert, Georges / Jung, Marc-René, Ringger, Kurt eds., *Orbis mediaevalis. Mélanges de langue et de littérature médiévales offerts à Reto Raduolf Bezzola à l'occasion de son quatre-vingtième anniversaire*, Bern, Francke, 285-296.
- Philipp-Sattel, Sabine 1996, *Parlar bellament en vulgar. Die Anfänge der katalanischen Schriftkultur im Mittelalter*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Picoche, Jacqueline / Marchello-Nizia, Christiane 1994, *Histoire de la langue française*, 3e éd. Paris, Nathan.
- Posner, Rebecca 1997, *Linguistic Change in French*, Oxford, Clarendon.
- Raible, Wolfgang 1993, 'Die Anfänge der italienischen Schriftkultur', *Romanische Forschungen* 105, 231-255.
- 1996, 'Relatinisierungstendenzen', in: Holtus / Metzeltin / Schmitt 1996, 120-134.

- Raynaud, Gaston 1876, *Etude sur le dialecte picard dans le Ponthieu d'après les chartes des XIIIe et XIVe siècles 1254-1333*, Paris, Vieweg.
- Remacle, Louis 1948, *Le problème de l'ancien wallon*, Liège, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres.
- 1992, *La différenciation dialectale en Belgique romane avant 1600*, Genève.
- Renzi, Lorenzo 1985, *Nuova introduzione alla filologia romanza*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Rickard, Peter 1974, *A History of the French Language*, London, Hutchinson University Library.
- Romaine, Suzanne 1982, *Socio-Historical Linguistics. Its Status and Methodology*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Sabatini, Francesco 1963/1964, 'Tra latino tardo e origini romanze', *Studi Linguistici Italiani* 4, 140-159.
- 1965, 'Esigenze di realismo e dislocazione morfologica in testi preromanzi', *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 7, 972-998.
- 1968, 'Dalla 'scripta latina rustica' alle 'scriptae' romanze', *Studi Medievali* 9, 1, 320-358.
- 1978, 'Lingua parlata, scripta e coscienza linguistica nelle origini romanze', *Atti del XIV Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza*, Vol. I, Napoli Amsterdam, 445-453.
- Sanga, Glauco ed. 1990, *Koinè in Italia delle Origini al Cinquecento*, Bergamo, Lubrina.
- 1995, 'La koinè italiana', in Holtus/Metzeltin/Schmitt 1995, 81-98.
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte 1983, *Traditionen des Sprechens. Elemente einer pragmatischen Sprachgeschichtsschreibung*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.
- 1996, *Idéologie, révolution et uniformité de la langue*, Liège, Mardaga.
- Selig, Maria 1995, *Volkssprachliche Schriftlichkeit im Mittelalter – Die Genese der altokzitanischen Schriftsprache*, Freiburg Habil.-thesis.
- 2001, 'El problema de la tipología de los textos románicos primitivos', in Jacob/Kabatek 2001, 233-248.
- Selig, Maria / Frank, Barbara / Hartmann, Jörg eds. 1993, *Le passage à l'écrit des langues romanes*, Tübingen, Narr.

- Serianni, Luca / Trifone, Pietro eds. 1993, *Storia della lingua italiana, I., I luoghi della codificazione*, Roma, Einaudi.
- Siegel, Jeff 1993, 'Introduction. Controversies in the study of koines and koineization', in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 99, 5-8.
- Solalinde, Antonio G. 1915, 'Intervención de Alfonso X en la redacción de sus obras', *Revista de Filología Española* 11, 283-288.
- Stempel, Wolf-Dieter 1972, 'Die Anfänge der romanischen Prosa im XIII. Jahrhundert', in Jauss, Hans Robert / Köhler, Erich eds. *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, vol. 1, *Généralités*, Heidelberg, Winter, 585-601.
- 1998, 'Zur Frage der Repräsentation gesprochener Sprache in der altfranzösischen Literatur', in Kablitz, Andreas / Neumann, Gerhard eds., *Mimesis und Simulation*, Freiburg, Rombach, 235-254.
- Tagliavini, Carlo 1972, *Le origini delle lingue neolatine*, 6a ed. Bologna, Pàtron.
- Terracini, Benvenuto 1956, *L'italia linguistica nell'alto Medioevo*, Torino, Gheroni.
- Van Reenen, Pieter / Van Reenen-Stein Karin eds. 1988, *Distributions spatiales et temporelles, constellations des manuscrits*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Torres Montes, Francisco 2006, 'Poítica, desarrollo socioeconómico e historia de las lenguas iberorrománicas', in Ernst/Glessgen/Schmitt/Schweickardt 2006, 1190-1202.
- Tosco, Mauro 2008, 'Introduction: Ausbau is everywhere!', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 191, 1-16.
- Trifone, Pietro 2006, 'Politica, sviluppo socio-economico e storia della lingua: Italo-romania', in Ernst/Glessgen/Schmitt/Schweickardt 2006, 1167-1177.
- Tuten, Donald 2003, *Koineization in medieval Spanish*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Veny, Joan 1985, *Introducció a la dialectologia catalana*, Barcelona, Enciclopedia catalana.
- Videsott, Paul 2009, *Padania scrittologica. Analisi scrittologiche e scrittometriche di testi in italiano settentrionale antico dalle origini al 1525*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Völker, Harald 2000, 'Chartes luxembourgeoises du XIIIe siècle. Scripta régionale, locale ou 'individuelle'', in Englebert, Annick / Pierrard, Michel / Rosier, Laurence / Van

- Raemdonck, Dan eds. *Actes du XXIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie romanes, Bruxelles, 23-29 juillet 1998*, Vol. V, 159-166.
- 2001 , ‘Die Skriptaforschung als eine Philologie der Varietäten. Zur Negation mit *ne ... nient* in den altfranzösischen Urkunden der Grafen von Luxemburg 1237-1281’, in Gärtner, Kurt / Holtus, Günter / Rapp, Andrea / Völker, Harald (eds.): *Skripta, Schreiblandschaften und Standardisierungstendenzen. Urkundensprachen im Grenzbereich von Germania und Romania im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Trier, KlioMedia.
- 2003, *Skripta und Variation. Untersuchungen zur Negation und zur Substantivflexion in altfranzösischen Urkunden der Grafschaft Luxemburg 1237-1281*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- 2006, ‘Politique, développement socio-économique et histoire des langues: Galloromania’, in Ernst/Glessgen/Schmitt/Schweickardt 2006, 1178-1190.
- Vossler, Karl 1929, *Frankreichs Kultur und Sprache*, 2nd ed., Heidelberg, Winter.
- Vurpas, Anne-Marie 1995, ‘Les scriptae francoprovençales’, in Holtus / Metzeltin /Schmitt 1995,389-405.
- Wartburg, Walter von 1951, *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*, Bern, Francke.
- Weimar, Peter 1972, ‘Zur Entstehung des sogenannten Tübinger Rechtsbuches und der *Exceptiones legum Romanorum* des Petrus’, in Wilhelm, Walter ed., *Studien zur europäischen Rechtsgeschichte. Festschrift Coing*, Frankfurt/Main Vittorio Klostermann, 1-24.
- Weinreich, Uriel 1954, ‘Is a Structural Dialectology Possible?’, *Word* 10, 388-400.
- Wenzel, Siegfried 1990, ‘Reflections on New Philology’, *Speculum* 65, 1990, 11-18.
- Wright, Roger 1982, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*, Liverpool, Francis Cairns.
- ed. 1991, *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages*, London-New York, Routledge.
- 2001, ‘La Sociofilología y el origen de la primera documentación cancillerescas en forma romance en Castilla’, in Jacob / Kabatek, 63-77.

- Wüest, Jakob 1979, *La dialectalisation de la Gallo-Romania. Problèmes phonologiques*, Berne, Francke.
- Wunderli, Peter 1965, 'Die ältesten romanischen Texte unter dem Gesichtswinkel von Protokoll und Vorlesen', *Vox Romanica* 24, 44-63.